A GENRE ANALYSIS OF THE PROCESSES OF PROFESSIONAL DOCUMENT DESIGN.

JOHN WHEATLEY
1994

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the University of Wolverhampton for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D)

January 1994

A Genre Analysis of the Processes of Professional Document Design.

School of Humanities and Social Sciences.
University of Wolverhampton, 1994.

ABSTRACT

This thesis offers a range of analytical approaches, all within a generic framework, to spoken professional communication, and specifically to the processes of document design in technical writing and public relations. The data presents the problem of dealing with two very different kinds of interaction; one largely interactive and the other largely monologic. A principal feature of the analysis to be found in this thesis is the use of several interlocking approaches. Part One of the thesis uses discourse analysis linked with topic type analysis, and Part Two uses Rhetorical Structure Theory linked with topic type analysis.

Chapters One to Four orient the thesis. Chapter Five deals with presentations. The three different presentation meetings are each shown to consist of the same five topic types. Additionally these topic types are shown to have a regular internal structure in terms of obligatory and optional elements that are realised by discourse analytic moves. Chapter Five looks at data that are of the same social activity and have similar textual characteristics. Chapter Six details generic features of texts that belong to the same social activity, a briefing, but which do not exhibit such close textual similarities. Chapter Seven completes the set of choices by examining texts that enact different social actions, a briefing and a draft review, but which make use of a similar text type, decision making.

Part Two of this thesis introduces a new way of analysing the data. This coincides with a shift in

emphasis to technical writing and the preponderance of monologic interaction in that data. Chapter Nine provides detailed RST analysis of monologic talk from the four pieces of interaction that are being dealt with; a Briefing and a Draft Review from both a technical writing and a public relations source. The Chapter is evidence of the mechanics of RST and its workability when applied to professional talk.
Chapter Ten offers a genre and intertextual study of professional document design texts. It shows how key top level relations such as Solutionhood in Draft Review and Enablement in briefing activity convey similar information about similar kinds of entity.

By the end of Chapter Ten three ways of making intertextual comparisons have been made available. Firstly there are differences in the discourse patterning. Secondly there is a change in top level rhetorical structure text organisation. Thirdly there is a change in information constituents as made visible by text type analysis.

Part Two of this thesis seeks to subsume a clause relational analysis within a broader sequential interactive discourse analysis. This is the opposite route to that taken by Hoey (Hoey 1986). This thesis concludes that the solution to the way these types of analysis should be interwoven will not be a once and for all decision but will depend on the kind of interaction in the text.
The thesis argues that a generic framework is very suitable for understanding professional communication and that a rigid formalistic approach to genre analysis needs to be replaced with a set of more flexible but interlocking analytical techniques.

Acknowledgements

Firstly ,thanks are due to Ian Connell, my supervisor, who sparked my interest in professional communication and who showed me how to make connections between linguistics and the broader field of communication studies. His help has been invaluable.

Secondly, thanks are due to all the professional document design teams who allowed me to record their data and to be an observer of the processes they went through. Thanks in particular to Frank Albrighton, Public Affairs Officer at Birmingham University, and to Richard Timms of CTC.

Thirdly, to the University of Wolverhampton for providing me with the opportunity to carry out this work.

Finally, to my wife and mother. They never lost faith that this strange work called research would eventually yield worthwhile results.

CONTENTS

PAGE
NUMBERING
AS ORIGINAL

A USER GUIDE TO THE THESIS

1. This thesis is heavily data centered. More than 9 hours data are accounted for in some detail by this thesis. Quantity is needed to support generalisations about patterns of interaction. Fine detail needs to be attended to to display these features.This user guide is intended to make access to the right data at the right time as easy as possible for the reader.

2. At the end of this section a brief one page description of all the data addressed in this thesis can be found. It uses basic communicative event categories to give a broad outline of the features that link and separate the different stages of professional document design activity that have been recorded and analysed here.

3. The communicative event descriptions are sequenced in the order that the data are analysed in the thesis, opening with public relations. First presentations followed by briefings and draft review. Then the technical writing data. First the briefing and finally the draft review.

4. Each analytic chapter will introduce the data in more detail. The information here is for quick reference, to such items as participant names, which are used regularly in the analysis, and for pooling information on all the data in one location.

5. The discourse terminology used is described in Chapter 2. The RST terminology used is referenced and discussed in Chapter 8. All the data in this thesis are to be found in the accompanying volume of appendices. Appendix A is for discourse analytic data and Appendix B for RST data.

6. The discourse analytic data is presented in the same order as the public relations data is sequenced in the analysis; presentations, briefings, then draft review. The RST data is presented first with the public relations texts; briefing first and then draft review. The technical writing data follows in the same order; briefing and then draft review.

7. In the discourse analytic chapters all the data is referenced first with a Tape number. This number is used throughout this introduction's communicative event description and in each analytical chapter. Secondly, the data has a Unit number. This refers to the topic type number, which is the unit of description used in all the discourse analysis chapters.

8. Nearly always, data that is described in detail is quoted in the body of the thesis chapter. The Tape number and Unit number are always given so that the reader may access the quoted information in its wider cotext in Appendix 1.

9. The RST data is presented in two formats. First all the data that is described using RST is presented in a simple form that shows the data and where they occur the monologic Units that RST is applied to. These units are numbered in the same way as the topic type units for the discourse data. Each unit is also enumerated 'clause by clause'. This gives the numbering system for RST schemas, over 100 of them in all, that constitute the RST analysis of monolog in this thesis. RST data is referenced first with the Tape number, then with the Unit number and finally with the 'clause' numbers that are to be found on the RST diagrams. Where data is discussed that is between monologic units, that shows how such talk may be introduced, closed down or temporarily halted, then the quote will be referenced with a Tape number and a pre or post Unit number to enable reader access in Appendix 2.

Communicative Event Tape 5

Professional Field	Public Relations Producing a Brochure to Attract Industrial Collaboration
Genre	Presentation
Topic	The designer's first sketches presented to the client for initial approval of her approach
Function	To get approval from the client for a distinctive way of designing this brochure before investing too much time in a full mock up that might not be acceptable.
Setting	Pro's office
Key	Informal but business like
Participants	Pro: Frank, the public affairs officer at Birmingham University and here presenter of the designer's work Client: Bob, head of industrial liaison at Birmingham University
Message Form	Spoken, face to face
Message Content	Presentation of visual work for understanding and evaluation
Rules for Interaction	Presenter has right to present unless there is other pressing need - such as to deal with a client clarification request or negative evaluation. So presentation is the default topic type.

The Client needs to be informed of what is going on. He is not a design expert. He must give some positive evaluation to what he is shown for progress to be made, for the next stage of the document design process to begin.

Communicative Event	Tape 11
Professional Field	Public Relations Producing a Brochure to Attract Industrial Collaboration
Genre	Presentation
Topic	Designer's Mock Up of the Brochure
Function	To get approval from the pro of the design for the brochure as preparation for Tape 15, the full presentation of the mock up to the client.
Setting	Pro's office
Key	Informal and businesslike
Participants	Designer: Juliana, Designer and Presenter. She has a long working history with the Birmingham Public Affairs Office Pro: Frank. Head of Public Affairs at Birmingham University
Message Form	Spoken, face to face
Message Content	Page by page visual presentation of brochure
Rules for Interaction	Presentation is the default topic type. Opening and closure of this activity is achieved with procedural topics as frames. Other regular topic types are clarify and evaluation. Negative evaluation is not used.

Unless there are pressing matters talk reverts to presentation topic types. The designer has extended speaking rights for this.

Communicative Event Tape 15

Professional Field	Public Relations Producing a Brochure to Attract Industrial Collaboration
Genre	Presentation
Topic	Designer's Mock Up Brochure
Function	To get approval from the client of the mock up so that the art work stage of brochure production can start. Also to clear up any late stage problems
Setting	Pro's office
Key	More formal than the other two presentations
Participants	Designer: Juliana, who does the presentation. Client: Bob, who is presented to. Pro: Frank, who is the facilitator.
Message Form	Spoken, face to face.
Message Content	Page by page visual presentation of brochure, dealing with problems and misunderstandings as they arise.
Rules for Interaction	Presentation is default topic type. The meeting opens and closes with procedural topics that frame the presentation activity. Other regularly occurring topic types are clarification and negative evaluation.

Unless there are pressing matters talk reverts to the presentation topic type. This is the default topic. The designer has extended speaking rights for this. Problems that do arise need to be dealt with here and now, not held in abeyance.

Communicative Event **Tape 4a**

Professional Field	Public Relations Producing a Folder to Attract Industrial Collaboration	
Genre	Briefing	
Topic	The specialist folder for biotechnology. It's form, content, uses and purposes. Its text and its illustrations.	
Function	To provide the designer with enough information to do a visual mockup of the folder.	
Setting	Pro's office	
Key	Business like / Informal	
Participants	Pro	Frank. Birmingham University Public Affairs Officer. Overall controller of document design process in both briefings
	Designer	Juliana. Regular working relationship with Pro. Her company is renowned and Frank likes quality.
	Client	Derek. Prof of Biology, semi retired and working now in Industrial Liaison. He coordinates information collection and is the main writer of his folder and provider of visuals.
Message Form	Spoken face to face. Some talk around the visual samples provided by the client	

Message Content	Information is provided by either member of the Birmingham University client team as briefing units, to be followed by a receipt marker from the designer. Requests for information and clarification are made by the designer when necessary.
Rules for Interaction	A feature of this briefing is the need for consensus on the information given to the designer, that it should be current, and agreed upon. This feature is checked regularly by Derek and when it is lacking we find decision topics are used to establish the status of the information before it can be passed on to the designer.

Communicative Event **Tape 4b & 4c**

Professional Field	Public Relations Producing a Brochure to Attract Industrial Collaboration	
Genre	Briefing	
Topic	The Industrial Liaison Brochure. Its form, content, uses and purposes. Its cover, illustrations and text	
Function	1. To provide the designer with enough information to produce design sketches for the next meeting 2. For Frank and Bob to agree on what this information will be.	
Setting	Pro's office	
Key	Businesslike / Informal	
Participants	Pro	Frank. Birmingham University Public Affairs Officer. Overall controller of document design process in both 4a and 4b.
	Designer	Juliana. Regular working relationship with Pro. Her company is renowned and Frank likes quality.
	Client 1	Bob. Director of Industrial Liaison. This brochure is being paid for out of his budget. He has commissioned Frank to produce text and coordinate brochure production. There is a

		friendly but competitive relationship between Frank and Bob.
	Client 2	Derek. He also works in industrial liaison. His folder is to be a family member of Bob's parent brochure.
Message Form	Spoken face to face. Talk centers on Frank's rough copy of a text for the brochure.	
Message Content	There is dispute over the information that can be passed on to Juliana as briefing material. This leads to procedural to determine how the meeting should proceed and to decision making to reach agreement on brochure features. Agreed information is then either directly passed on to Juliana or reformulated for her benefit by the pro. Requests for information and clarification from designer when necessary. A progression from procedural work through decision making activity to briefing discussion	
Rules for Interaction	Frank is the facilitator of this meeting. He sets the agenda and directs the pace of progress. Within this framework, the client has the right to challenge and dispute both the content and the procedure of the meeting.	
Additional Information	Tape 4b is the disputative section of the meeting, with long decision making topics. Tape 4c is the same meeting once strict time constraints have been imposed by the pro.	

Communicative Event	Tape 7
Professional Field	Technical Writing. Producing a Software Manual
Genre	Briefing
Topic	Olympic Resources and the Workings of their Investment Systems
Function	To provide the technical writer with enough of the right kind of information for him to set about a first draft of a manual for syndicate investments
Setting	The client's office
Key	Business like. This is the first business meeting between these two participants.
Participants	Client: Martin. He is Client Services Manager at Olympic Resources. Technical Writer: Richard. He works for CTC, a private consultancy.
Message Form	Spoken, face to face.
Message Content	Information about the product - what it does, what it's like, how it works. Much of this is done by means of an on screen presentation.
Rules for Interaction	Information needs to be provided by the Client. The technical writer's role is to listen,

check, do confirm requests and ask questions. Only the client is familiar with the product so only he can structure the provision of information. The client's strategy is to show the technical writer how the product works, and who will be using it, so he can then produce documentation.

Communicative Event	Tape 12
Professional Field	Technical Writing. Producing a Software Manual.
Genre	Draft Check
Topic	The technical writer's first draft of the manual, produced from the Briefing in Tape 7.
Function	To evaluate this first draft. To make corrections and improve it for second and third drafts
Setting	The client's office
Key	Business like
Participants	Client 1 Martin. He is Client Services Manager at Olympic Resources. He provided the Briefing in Tape 7. Client 2 Tom. Martin's boss and designer of the software Technical Writer Richard. He works for CTC, a private consultancy.
Message Form	Spoken, face to face.
Message Content	Negative Evaluation of Richard's draft with suggestions for improvements. Plus new ideas occurring that need to be installed in the 2nd draft
Rules for Interaction	Tom is a powerful participant. His view of the product and the documentation very largely holds

in this meeting. He is critical of the technical writer's draft and of his briefing colleague's views on the software and what users should be told about it.

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 A Text Based Analysis of Document Design

This thesis is a text based study of talk that occurs within a document design setting. All the data involve at least a public relations officer or a technical writer and a client. All the data were recorded either in the client's office or the consultant's. In this thesis `consultant' will be used as a general word to cover technical writer, public relations officer (pro) or designer when dealing with a company representative, who will be referred to as `client'.

Chapters 3 and 4 will discuss key concepts and areas of study that relate to this thesis, particularly to the discourse approach taken in Part One. Chapter 2 will outline the discourse analytical approach taken to the data and applied to it in Chapters 5, 6, and 7. Genre and its relations with register and discourse are discussed in Chapter 3, and Chapter 4 is an outline of relevant work in the field of organisational communication. The semantic analysis that forms Part Two of this thesis is introduced in Chapter 8.

This Introduction will locate the analysis presented here in broader terms, by relating it to other work in the same field and to other conceptual approaches, some of which have been accommodated here and others which have not.

The work has been driven by the desire to discover generic features of the document design interaction that has been recorded, transcribed, and which forms the raw material of this thesis. In her key article on genre Carolyn Miller writes

> To consider as potential genres such homely discourse as the letter of recommendation, the user manual, the progress report, the ransom note, the lecture and the white paper is not to trivialize the study of genres; it is to take seriously the rhetoric in which we are immersed and the situations in which we find ourselves.
> (Miller 84, p.155)

This article has provided initial justification for doing genre analysis on what I call the document design process. Most work on genre has been in literary areas. More recent linguistic work on genre has still tended to focus on written text. Miller claims that all aspects of life, not just literature, are available for genre analysis and her specification of the user manual is particularly apposite to this thesis which deals with the processes that bring such texts into existence. Ventola's work (see Chapter 3) is the first main effort to produce a linguistically grounded generic description of spoken interaction.

More solid support for a generic approach to spoken activity comes from Bakhtin. He writes

> In essence, language, or functional styles are nothing other than generic styles for certain spheres of human activity and communication. Each sphere has and applies its own genres that correspond to its own specific conditions. A particular function (scientific, technical,

> commentarial, business, everyday) and the particular conditions of speech communication specific for each sphere give rise to particular genres, that is certain relatively stable thematic, compositional and stylistic types of utterance.
> (Bakhtin 86, p.64)

Not only do these articles by Miller and Bakhtin provide initial optimism for the researcher into spoken professional genres but in addition, they handle key issues that I have approached from another direction; linguistic analysis.

Swales has recently cautioned the genre analyst against too complete a reliance on a text based approach.

> ... when we deal with individual texts (or clusters of them) we ignore investigating context of situation and context of culture at some peril.
> (Swales 92, p.9)

He criticizes systemic linguistics for paying lip service to these notions but rarely connecting their analysis to the social and cultural environment; for behaving like `archaeologists' rather than `anthropologists'. This is a criticism that this research is in part open to. While I agree with his point, I hope to offer some defence of myself here. This thesis is unashamedly a linguistic analysis of talk in the document design process. However its focus, on the talk that leads to the production of public relations brochures, and user manuals, might well be seen as useful anthropological data itself. I have asked practitioners how they go about their work but the recorded data presented here provides a detailed answer to such questions. Answers which are free of the selective perceptions that arise when people are asked to describe what it is they do. That the focus of my attention is on procedural data rather than final product text is one part of my defence. Another is that we remain desperately short of authentic data in this area of study. What can and cannot be revealed by the analysis of professional processual data has not yet been established. Finally, the context of culture is not only in part responsible for the genre systems used in document design but appropriate linguistic analysis will reveal features of this context of culture in the data.

Halliday repeatedly stresses that text is a semantic unit; a process of making meaning in a social context (e.g. Halliday 1978, ch7). All the analysis that follows, while not being strictly Hallidayan, is based on this view of the working of language and looks for meaning as a socially embedded phenomenon. This results in an emphasis on common social practice, on what is shared in getting document design work done, and a deemphasis of the personal, the individual qualities of the participants and their psycholinguistic patterns of behaviour. According to this thesis, the context of culture should be located in the typical patterns of interaction that are used to construct the common elements of such a regularly occurring social practice as document design, and secondly in the meanings that are constructed and exchanged within these sequences of interaction.

Kress, as if creating a research space for this thesis, states

> We know next to nothing about the kinds of text current within a given social structure at a given time, nor about their functions, their forms, meanings and constraints.
> (Kress 85, p.139)

It is just this absence of understanding that this thesis intends to redress. There has been remarkably little work done on talk at work from a sociolinguistic perspective. What has, is discussed in Chapter 3. There has been little study of institutional talk, genres of social activity within the work place that pays any attention to the context of culture, Lemke 90a being a notable exception. Work that has been done on institutional talk has come from an unexpected source; Conversation Analysis (see Drew & Heritage 1992, and Firth 1991). Nevertheless I want to propose that a discourse analytic / functional linguistic perspective is better equipped for accessing genre, the context of culture, and regularly recurring rhetorical actions in a range of related social activities.

1.2 A Defence of a Discourse Analytic Approach

Monolog

As a starting point we should consider the significance of one prevalent feature of the data analysed here, and that is its monologic quality.

The technical writing data in particular consist of long stretches of talk where only one participant is producing new information and the utterances of the other(s) is reduced to backchannel and clarification. Jacoby (e-mail communication) tells me that Conversation Analysis, (from here on CA) treats monolog in exactly the same way it treats dialogue, that this is the position taken by Sacks (Sacks 84). There are very few studies of monolog from either a CA or DA (Discourse Analysis) perspective. Lemke 1990a and Malcolm 1988 are functional linguistic exceptions. There is also a recent work of social psychology that uses CA on monologic data. Wooffitt (1992) is interested in the way people tell stories of paranormal experiences. The book is to be welcomed as more evidence of Social Psychology abandoning the experimental paradigm and examining in its place how people construct and explain their own experiences. CA, with its well developed Garfinkelian notion of the account, is probably a good method of analysis to adopt. It seems to be a good method for accessing micro level features of the data and individual strategies that may be of interest to a social psychologist. What it cannot do is provide a comprehensive analysis of the data or recognise much that might be generic in such a form of talk.

Conversation Analysis

There is reason to believe that CA is the dominant paradigm for analysing talk at this time. Not only is it producing pioneering work on institutional discourse but it is regularly making the claim to be more subtle, more accurate, more able to deal with the real nature of talk, than discourse analysis (see Levinson 1979, 1981 & 1983, Drew & Heritage 1992, and Wooffitt 1992). Discourse analysts have had little to say in return. My purpose here is not to critique CA, indeed much of its formal apparatus is made use of at one point or another in the analysis that follows. Turn taking and recipient design in particular are features that I comment on in this data. My position is that DA is a more flexible and broader paradigm, able and willing to make use of CA tools and concepts, while CA is a restricted means of analysis. Because of the rigid constraints CA imposes upon itself, its procedure is to make more and more detailed descriptions of data with the tools at its disposal but never to move beyond the fine grain of interaction to focus on issues of a more general or macro nature, such as broad similarities in the way that texts performing a similar social function unfold, on issues such as genre. The tools of CA, adjacency pairs, accountability, reflexivity of context may all be of use in genre analysis, but they are unlikely to be put to such use by a CA practitioner.

If one looks at early DA work on monolog, the Coulthard & Montgomery 1981 study, then it is not that difficult to agree with Taylor and Cameron (1987) that it says little beyond the fact that a lecture has a beginning, middle and end structure. Coulthard and Montgomery (1981) call their findings `pre theoretical'. They do say, however, that they were planning to combine their approaches to discourse analysis with "current work in the description of written texts (Winter 1977, Hoey 1979, 1981)", (op cit p.33).

Such work, I believe, was never done. However it is the path that this research has taken; to combine the discourse analysis focus on sequential features of interaction with the Hoey & Winter focus on semantics and clause relations. The theoretical strength of the DA paradigm is its openness to combining different kinds of text analysis and its lack of rigidity regarding how this should be done. DA is a pragmatic approach to text, but not unprincipled. It is committed to providing full accounts of authentic data and the view that data itself will reveal the ways society uses language and constructs different social activities. Its analytical techniques, however, have and should change as we understand more about discourse from a social perspective.

Monolog remains a problem for CA however. It is left with Schegloff's dictum that monolog is of the same nature as dialogue. The problem this poses is that CA's analytical corner stone is sequentiality. Analysis starts and ends with turn taking and adjacency pairs; conspicuously absent features from monologic text. Wooffitt describes the basic CA position on monolog.

> The sets of methodic procedures by which their talk is produced are of the same order as those displayed for analytic inspection in conversational material. That is there is no qualitative difference between long stretches of uninterrupted talk and talk that is constituted through a turn taking system.
> (Wooffitt 92, p.68)

For a discipline that deals with micro detailed features in stretches of talk this is an oversimplifying generalisation, of the kind that CA often accuses discourse analysts.

Casual Conversation and Genre

The position stems, I believe, from the CA tenet that casual conversation is the basic kind of talk, against which all other talk can be measured. Firth states the CA position like this.

> ... conversation analysts have been drawn towards analysing a form of talk which is seen to be `basic', in the sense of being `mundane' and hence generic for other forms of talk; this `generic' form of talk is casual conversation.
> (Firth 91, p.3)

This is a position that a genre approach to talk could take issue with. Kress says that

> social institutions produce specific ways of writing or talking about certain areas of social life.
> (Kress 85, p.137)

Bakhtin, who could be quoted many times on this issue, is more categorical. He writes;

> The speaker's speech will is manifested primarily in the choice of a particular speech genre. This choice is determined by the specific nature of
> the given sphere of speech communication, semantic (thematic considerations), the concrete situation of the speech communication... We speak only in definite speech genres, that is

> all our utterances have definite and relatively stable typical forms of construction of the whole.
> (Bakhtin 86, p.78)

This research seeks to provide detailed textual and analytical evidence for the positions taken by Kress and Bakhtin. According to Bakhtin, it is speech genres that provide a basic categorisation of language use. If we learn to combine appropriate forms with appropriate meanings, to package what we have to say in a socially permitted way, then I believe that this CA notion of the primacy of casual conversation need not be the case. Casual conversation, I believe could be specified into a number of genres. Malcolm's study (Malcolm 1988) sees casual conversation as a message focussed register rather than as a discourse focussed one, as most transactional language would be, because it lacks `experiential and functional consistency (op cit p.73). Her work also shows that casual conversation is not always the default option for talk either between adults or children.

Genre and CA Approaches to talk are diametrically opposed. CA sees casual conversation as the base form of human activity in relation to which all other kinds of institutional talk are limited variations. This is a view that informs the collection of articles in Drew and Heritage 1992. In the introductory chapter the authors write;

> For if it can be shown that the participants in a vernacularly characterised institutional setting such as a courtroom pervasively organise their turn taking in a way that is distinctive

from ordinary conversation, it can be proposed that they are organising their conduct so as to display and realise its 'institutional' character over its course and that they are doing so recurrently and pervasively.

and

To the extent that the participants' talk is conducted within the constraints of a specialized turn taking system, other systematic differences tend to emerge. These differences commonly involve specific reductions of the range of options and opportunities for action that are characteristic in conversation.
(Drew & Heritage 92, p.26)

Much of the work in this collection is very fine and enlightening on the micro details of institutional talk. From a genre point of view, however, it is inadequate in that although it fine tunes very detailed analyses of turn taking patterns and such phenomena, it never looks further to see typified patterns of social practice constituting genres of social action. This limited vision is due partly to the CA obsession with casual conversation and I believe even more to the insistence that any feature to be described in the data, as relevant to the talk in hand, must in some way be 'demonstrably oriented to' by the participants involved. It is this feature that interferes with a genre approach to text.

Regarding people's orientation to speech genres Bakhtin writes

> Our repertoire of oral (and written) speech genres is rich. We use them confidently and skillfully in practice, and it is quite possible for us not even to suspect their existence in theory.
> (Bakhtin 86, p.78)

Genre analysis can be seen as an attempt to provide the theory that underpins everyday social practice. If these social practices are opaque in nature to their users then there is little hope that they will be 'demonstrably oriented to' by participants. The everyday nature of many speech genres, the very quality most sought by conversation analysis is likely to remain concealed by an analysis that only focusses on what participants themselves visibly or audibly orient to. This is a view repeatedly stressed by Schegloff (see for example Schegloff 1992) and accepted in the following way in the introductory article of Talk at Work.

> .. they [the contributors to this volume] are concerned to show that analytically relevant characterizations of social interactants are grounded in empirical observations that show that the participants themselves are demonstrably oriented to the identities or attributes in question.
> (Drew & Heritage 92, p20)

This might be a useful starting point for doing real world social psychology but can hardly be of use in genre analysis.

1.3 Context, Genre, and Conversation Analysis

Carolyn Miler talks of genres as 'typified rhetorical actions based in recurrent situations' (Miller 84, p.159). Making sense of the term 'rhetorical action' is not easy. Miller's article suggests that it may be accessible by interpreting the interrelatedness of form, substance and context.

> ... context is a third hierarchical level to meaning, encompassing both substance and form and enabling interpretation of the action resulting from their fusion.
> (op cit, p.159)

This thesis has approached this problem from the practical angle of how to deal adequately with the data. Still the solutions offered here are compatible with this theory of meaning put forward by Miller. The form of document design activity has been accessed in the first half of this thesis through discourse analysis. Substance has been foregrounded in the second half through rhetorical structure theory. These are only sense making activities when attention is given to the context in which form and substance fuse. This thesis aims to take full account of context; to construe what is said and how it is said only in a contextual light and in reverse to develop an understanding of context from the regularly occurring patterns of interaction in the data.

CA gives prominence to the notion of context but is dismissive of discourse analysis use of the concept. CA takes the view that utterances are 'doubly contextual' (See Heritage 1984 for a full discussion).

> First, utterances and actions are <u>context shaped</u>. Their contributions to an ongoing sequence of actions cannot be adequately understood except by reference to the context in which they participate. . . Second, utterances and actions are <u>context renewing</u>. Since every current utterance will itself form the immediate context for some next action in a sequence it will inevitably contribute to the contextual framework in terms of which the next action will be understood.
> (Drew & Heritage 92, p.19)

This is an exciting aspect of CA, one developed by the ethnomethodological work of Garfinkel in the sixties. The article above compares the CA context sensitive approach to what they dismissively call the 'bucket theory of context' made use of by discourse analysis.

First, to comment on the view of context described above. From this I can see no reason why CA should not produce genre analysis. A view of utterances being shaped by the institutional features within which they occur and recreating and restructuring the features of that institution through each new utterance appears very similar to the position that Giddens develops in his work on structuration theory, (Giddens 1979).

Structuration Theory

The theory, as I read it, is intended to deal at one and the same time with those actions that are consciously performed, and those which are performed skillfully, `but which the actor is not able to formulate discursively' (Giddens 79, p.57). This formulation deals both with action as CA would envision it, as oriented to by participants, and also recognises that large parts of what we do are done consciously and knowingly but without the ability to formulate what is being done. CA is limited to the former only, whereas discourse and genre analysis can make use of both.

Structuration theory consists of structure and system. Structure is defined as

> Rules and resources, organised as properties of social systems. . . [they] are characterised by the `absence of a subject'.
> (op cit, p.67)

Systems are

> Reproduced relations between actors or collectivities, organised as regular social practices
> (op cit p.67)

The difference between a CA view of social action and a structuration view, which I think is one that supports genre analysis, is that for CA the existence of structure is unclear. Practitioners admit the existence of social structure (Firth, private communication) but do not, or cannot, use it in their analysis unless it is demonstrably oriented to by the participants. Giddens' view on social action, sketched above, takes the view that only certain parts of our actions can be formulated in talk. Of course this is a very useful source of understanding for the genre analyst. The names people assign to the activities they are involved in is one indication of a genre location and its boundaries. Discourse analysis however can take advantage of the regularised patterns of interaction and semantic relations that occur in talk in similar settings in order to find evidence of generic activity, even when it is not demonstrably oriented to, is not consciously constructed by the individual.

It is an uncertain path; one is forever making plausibility judgements on the meaning that can be assigned to utterances. My defence for this is that within the framework of genre analysis one is looking for textual features that will support the hypothesis that two or more texts belong to the same genre. One makes plausibility judgements about the function of certain recurring types of utterance. The fact that a type of utterance can be seen to occur and recur in a similar sequential slot, and that the same plausible judgements can be made about each instance, both support the genre hypothesis and the plausible function judgement that had to be made to discover textual features of the genre in question. CA meanwhile is strapped in a world of intersubjectivity and looking for certainty in its analysis. This leads firstly to limited coverage of the data; CA typically leaves swathes of talk undiscussed, secondly, to more and more detailed analysis of those points that do become available through CA through turn taking ad adjacency pairs and the like, and thirdly, across a range of articles a repetitive reworking of first principles rather than a developing improving approach to analysis.

1.4 A Final Word on Context

Finally, I feel something must be said to redress the unjust view of context assigned to discourse analysts by the Drew and Heritage book. They, Wooffitt, and Levinson consistently produce unsubstantial negative evaluation of discourse analytic work. Their approach is to take issue with a single aspect of the work and to ignore the rest. Levinson is dismissive of Searlean speech acts, Wooffitt of the work of Gilbert and Mulkay and Drew and Heritage of the work of Sinclair and Coulthard. There is no need to offer detailed defences for these works. It may suffice to say that discourse analysis is not to be discredited by a negative evaluation of any of these pieces of work. Searle's work has informed discourse analysis, but itself is philosophy rather than discourse analysis. Gilbert and Mulkay were social psychologists attempting quite pioneering work in the field, but not work that cannot be improved upon. The Sinclair & Coulthard work too was pioneering in the study of discourse and of institutional talk. As documented in the RST theory chapter, however, Sinclair's view of discourse analysis has naturally developed over the past twenty years. It is the lot of CA to remain faithful to the principles of Garfinkel, Sacks and Schegloff. Likewise, the approach to discourse analysis taken in this thesis is indebted to the work of Sinclair and Coulthard but, like that of Lampi, who is also a product of the Birmingham school, no longer seeks such a close hook up between grammar and discourse, and focusses on stretches of text larger than the exchange, which was the natural focus for the original Birmingham work as the most immediate interactive unit.

Context and Intertextuality

The term `bucket approach' to describe the Discourse Analytic view of context is wholly inaccurate.
Here is a quote from Lemke that I think shows similar sensitivity to the notion of context as does the CA view and can be seen as typical of discourse analysis views on context that have been shaped by such figures as Malinowski and J.R Firth.

> Each action takes its meaning from a context which it itself helps to create. More precisely the DYNAMIC meaning of an action is its meaning in the context-up-to now (the time created by its performance) at which point it has a further MEANING POTENTIAL contingent on the possible actions that may follow it ...
> (Lemke 88, p.158)

Lemke's views on context spread wider than this to include not only the ongoing action in which the talk occurs but other actions of a similar nature that provide an intertextual context for understanding and producing utterances as part of ongoing social practices.

> What is most often missing in contextual models of semantics is reference to intertextual contextualisation (Lemke 85). It is not just by construing semantic relations to the immediate textual, or even situational context that we make a word or phrase mean. It is also by construing relations to other texts and situations in which that word or phrase has been used. This kind of contextualisation would be hopelessly under-determined, of course, were it not for the fundamental fact that patterns of semantic relations among the same or closely related words and phrases are regularly repeated over and over again in many texts in a given community.
> (op cit, p.165)

What we see here is the context sensitive view of CA applied to a more macro vision of communication that is available to conversation analysts. It is a view of context that requires linguistics to show up contextual links between different texts in terms of lexical semantics, as Lemke is talking, or, as I try to develop in the second half of this thesis by means of RST, in terms of regularly recurring rhetorical relations. One needs a wider rage of analytical tools to do genre analysis than is available to CA. It is the conclusion of this work that no one analytical method will provide substantive proof of genre but that the analysis is best pursued in terms of a range of analytical techniques, including some borrowed from CA alongside others more firmly grounded in linguistics and textual features that belong to the broad church of discourse analysis.

1.5 Key Features of the Analytical Approach Taken in this Thesis

This thesis has a methodological emphasis. It deals woth inherently interesting data, until this time an unresearched activity, the process of professional document design. In order to successfully address such data methodological developments have been necessitated.

1. Rhetorical Structure Theory is applied to interactive spoken data for the first time.

2. Rhetorical Structure Theory provides a way into the analysis of monolog, which has long been problematic for text analysts.

3. Rhetorical Structure Theory is successfully used as a tool of genre analysis. This has been called for by Mannn and Thgompson but not evident in published work until now.

4. This thesis offers a set of mutually supportive analytical techniques that can locate generic features of complex professional interaction. It is this complexity that makes rigid formal approaches unworkable.

CHAPTER 2 TERMINOLOGY

2.1 Discourse Analysis

Where possible, the discourse analysis used in this thesis uses everyday terms to capture the function being assigned to each discourse unit. There is no rank scale approach to the analysis, Sinclair & Coulthard 1975). The grammatical approach to coding discourse has been removed from this framework. Each unit can be called a move, but only some of the units correspond to what Sinclair and Coulthard (ibid) call moves e.g frame and focus, while others refer to what they call acts. This is not a problem. Once discourse units no longer are expected to possess grammatical characteristics they can vary in size. The analysis here tries to code at a discourse message level(Halliday and Hasan 1985, Martin 1983b), and to recode for each identifiable unit of meaning. Considering the lack of any truly discourse level system of description, the analysis is ad hoc and experimental. Units that regularly work have been retained, others rejected. A large number of units are recognised in this thesis. Nevertheless, those that occur regularly are far fewer in number and it is these units that display regular patterning in the talk and variation between the discourse types.

Many of the categories in use here have been taken from other sources. Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) provide the basic terminology for much of the more general interaction and mechanisms for information receipt; inform, reply, acknowledge, accept, evaluate, cue, elicit, directive, frame and focus. Lampi (1986) provides the terminology for an overview of a coding system for business negotiation, including some moves that regularly form a part of the decision making activity; self support, other support, and clarification. Jackson and Jacobs (1981) supply the notion of proposal and alternative proposal which are central in this thesis to the coding of decisioning. Martin (1981) is the source of the confirmation and confirmation request units. Conversation analysis provides descriptions of account (Garfinkel 1967), news marker (Greatbatch 1988) and repair (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977). Others belong either to common sense or to me, hopefully both. Hybrid terms, such as upshot confirmation request, and other terms that may cause confusion, are described as and when they occur with any frequency.

The purpose of the coding scheme is to provide an initial functional gloss for each unit as it occurs in the context of other units. Further analytic work follows which is necessary for revealing generic features in the talk. The number of moves is not so small as to insist that quite different pieces of interaction receive similar coding, nor is it so unmanageable that regularity in coding should disappear from view. Sinclair and Coulthard looked to provide a grammar of discourse, using a rank scale approach, but they also looked to provide a detailed functional sequential description of classroom discourse. Their categories for moves and acts, therefore, have a classroom bias. Others have sought to establish yet more rigidly the grammatical nature of the exchange, (Berry (1981a & 1981b) and Stubbs (1983), at the expense of developing discourse analysis as a tool for exploring systematic language variation.

Halliday (1980), Ventola (1987) and Martin (1981) look to develop a model of discourse analysis that will capture different kinds of talk within a very economical descriptive system. Their approach is grounded in systemic grammar. It claims to account for many different kinds of language use with a minimal number of categories. The face validity at least for the Sydney school discourse model applied to document design activities is low. Much of the talk is concerned with proposals and counter proposals, their evaluation, acceptance, rejection and refinement. This is an activity that falls in between goods and services and information exchange, and also in between giving and demanding. These are the fundamental choice parameters of the Sydney model. No doubt suggest and proposal based moves can be accommodated at a greater degree of delicacy but this systemic model seems far better suited to dealing with service encounters than business negotiation. By using it I may have been able to refine the system network started by Halliday and developed by Martin and Ventola but I would not have learned much that was interesting about the document design data.

I would not have been able to develop a topic type level analysis with it, because the data would have been squeezed uncomfortably into too few categories, making its idiosyncratic yet regular features, as presentation data for example, unrecognisable or undifferentiable from other kinds of talk. The lack of a clearly defined slot for proposal activity would not have assisted the development of a decision making sequence model as found in Chapter 7 either. The Sydney School model of discourse analysis is unsuitable for dealing with a discourse unit above the level of the exchange, as this thesis does.

A discourse model with a grammatical core needs to confine its terminology in order to apply it to different kinds of data. This is not the case for a discourse level description of related social activities. I am not working with a universal discourse system. I am happy to work with discourse categories that may well be specific to the document design activity. The generalisable quality arises from the matching of these specific discourse moves, according to occurrence and sequential placement, to a limited number of topic types, which in turn can have a pattern of occurrence. It is the occurrence of patterned behaviour, that can be described functionally, that has genre analysis application. It is neither essential nor even always useful to rely on the same set of functional elements, especially as the approach taken to genre here, like much of the Sydney school work, is centrally concerned with linking language activity and social activity. As the analysis throughout this thesis seeks to show, clearly related instances of social activity can be constructed with different functional elements, according to strategy or local conditions. This need not prevent us from seeing shared generic features in the social activities in question.

There has been little discourse analysis in fact that works with units larger than the exchange. Lampi's system is one that owes much to the work of Sinclair and Coulthard, but which does not take on board the rank scale approach. She is looking for larger elements, phase and topic based, to capture regularities in bargaining interaction above exchange level. This is an approach that I share, indeed that I discovered from her work, (Lampi 86).

She, however, is not looking to describe negotiation at a generic level. She links up a discourse analytic approach with pragmatics, locating preferreds and dispreferred participant actions in local discourse sites. The notion of linking discourse analysis with other forms of linguistic analysis is a debt I have to both Lampi and the Sydney school, especially Eija Ventola (1987), where there is a full scale working of systemic genre analysis at the discourse level. This is discussed more fully in the next chapter and again in Chapter 8.

This research seeks to discover generic features of document design from a discourse analytic starting point. It is only a starting point. It provides a basic level of functional description for the different kinds of related activity that constitute document design. For the discourse analysis to be of use in a genre approach to spoken interaction, it needs to be able to capture regularities at a level above the exchange. In Sinclair and Coulthard terminology, we need to understand the structure and function of larger units such as the transaction or lesson. In this thesis such units are topic type and the various interactive stages of the document design process; presentation, briefing and draft review. Sinclair and Coulthard left their larger units unspecified. This task of specification and description is one of the main ones tackled in this research.

The stages of the social activity are seen as being composed of a range of topic types; a limited number of recurring sequences of activity. It is at this level, the top level of the Sinclair and Coulthard rank scale, that genre features are investigated by this thesis. Exchange and lower level units are less likely to be genre specific; eliciting and informing exchanges are not limited to classroom contexts. In Lemke's terminology (1990a) these are rhetorical structures, lower down the scale than generic functional elements. They are units that can be put to a range of different generic uses as they occur in different contexts. Even the topic types identified by this thesis need not be genre specific. They do however become so in terms of the company they keep, their context, and in terms of the social activity that they are used to construct.

2.2 Topic Type Analysis

All the analysis in Chapters 5 to 7 is seeking regularly occurring topic types, identified in terms of their discourse characteristics. Davies's work on topic type is reviewed briefly at the start of Chapter 5 and co-applied with discourse analysis through Part One of this thesis. In Part Two it is discussed more fully in Chapter 8 and co-applied with RST analysis in Chapter 10. Topic type analysis provides a bridge between the two approaches to genre that are developed in this thesis. In Part 1 the approach is largely sequential. It is the dynamic pattern of unfolding in the same and different events that is analysed and used as a key genre feature.

In Part Two of this thesis there is a switch in focus away from public relations data to technical writing data, coupled with a switch from largely dialogic interaction to more monologic talk that led to the use of `Semantic Discourse Analysis' (van Dijk 85). The approach developed here, however, was not to look for macrostructures, a term which I think can be discarded in favour of genre, but to look for semantic, pragmatic and rhetorical text and event features that could be assigned to one or other genre as functional elements.

The semantic analysis is detailed in Chapter 8. Here it should suffice to say that the Davies model, involving looking for semantically based information constituents within a text, was more naturally suited to the function it was given in Part 2. In Part 1 of this thesis the notion of topic type has been taken and remolded somewhat to function as a means of describing recurring sequential units of activity that, while not necessarily dealing with the same topic, did perform a similar function.

The analytical method in toto can be captured as follows.

Meaning Through Sequentiality [Discourse Analysis
+
Topic Type Analysis]

PLUS

Meaning Through Rhetorical Relations [Rhetorical Structure Analysis
+
Topic Type Analysis]

PRODUCES

A Linguistically Grounded Approach to Genres of Social Activity

This allows one to move away from what van Dijk admits is a `theoretical reconstruction' (van Dijk 85, p.115) of global level regularity in text (macro structures in van Dijk's terminology) to a linguistically centered analysis of events that are constructed through language, which is how this thesis views genre.

The notion of topic type is particularly useful in Part 1 of this thesis, not solely because it provides a suitable functional unit within which discourse regularity and patterning can be looked for. It also provides a means of seeing regularity in texts which the discourse analysis alone might hide. It provides a means of recognising 'discourse type' similarity, even when the 'text types' vary, (Virtanen 1992).

Cook (1989), Virtanen (1992), Enkvist (1991) and van Dijk (1985) all recognise that there is a problem with the specification and separation of text type and discourse type, a problem largely overlooked by the Sydney school. Discourse type can be glossed as the function of a text and text type as its form. Virtanen (1992) provides a detailed descriptive analysis of the way the two interact but her purpose is more in developing a classification system for text based on internal criteria, than in reaching a fuller understanding of how regularly produced activities within a society fulfill set purposes and are then enacted within a limited range of text types. Van Dijk's theory of macrostructures (van Dijk 1980 & 1985) is, if anything, too well stocked with linguistic theories. At various points in this thesis I complain that the Sydney school apply grammar based linguistics to discourse analysis but van Dijk even employs Chomskyan notions of transformation when he posits the qualities a macrostructure should have. Work on macrostructure is top heavy with theory and too light on practical working examples. Ventola (1989) makes similar points about the van Dijk work and also points out that what he has to say about macrostructures is very largely concerned with written rather than spoken text. Ignoring spoken text makes maintaining the distinction between text type and discourse type easier. Linguistics has a less well developed sense of spoken text types. As this thesis shows througho-ut, a generic approach to spoken text has little option but to confront the issue head on.

Enkvist sees a different direction that linguistics needs to move in.

> ... we are moving from the world of absolute rules into the world of relative success and aesthetic merit. We are moving from linguistics in the narrow sense into rhetoric. This to me is just fine. In emphasising not only syntax but also pragmatics we are moving from codes to usage, from structural abstraction back into real life.
>
> (Enkvist 91, p.20)

Enkvist's key concern is the `interaction between discourse structure, text types, styles and registers, (op cit p.14). This, plus the above quoted notion of a move from pure linguistics, even of a systemic kind, towards a concern for rhetoric is the precise site of what I call genre analysis in this thesis.

Linguistics needs to fully accept variation in text and not expect any limited repertoire of analytical method to perform effectively all the time. This thesis makes no claim that the analysis in it will be effective for all other applications. A different set of discourse moves and different topic types are sure to be needed. The combination of these two approaches to sequential patterning of text however, discourse analysis and topic type analysis, is seen as having potential value over a wide range of types of spoken interaction. The strong claim made by this thesis is that it is an effective combination for revealing generic characteristics of document design interaction.

2.3 Discourse Analysis Moves Used in this Thesis

1. Discourse Moves that Occur across the Document Design Genres

Full Term	Abbreviation	Gloss
Continued	cont	Showing that a move continues across another's turn
Cue	cue	Specify who should talk next
Directive	dir	Command that something be done or not done
Elaborate	elab	To expand on a previous act, usually an inform or Decision Proposal or negative evaluation
Elicit	el	Request information
Evaluate	eval	When Assessment is given that is neither clearly positive or negative
Focus	focus	Direct group attention to an item or page in the documentation
Fragment	fg	Uncoded incomplete utterance
Frame	frame	Marker of boundaries in discourse
Gist	gist	To summarise

		one's own talk
Inform	inf	Basic and Very Commonly Occurring. Its function is to give information to another participant
Meta Inform	MetaI	Inform about the nature of the ongoing communication
News Marker	NewsM	Showing that what information has been receive had news value.
Procedural	proc	An informing move dealing with procedural matters
Purpose	purp	What something is meant to cause
Qualify	qual	Reduce force of what has been said
Read	rd	When text is being read in the meeting
Reason	reason	To offer an explanation for something
Reformulate	reform	Find new words to say what has been said already
Repair	repair	Correct one's own talk
Repeat	repeat	Say something again
Reply	reply	Response to a request or elicit
Request	req	To elicit an action from another partici-

		pant
Restate	restate	To say something again in the same or only a slightly varied way
Result	result	What was caused by something
Return	return	Moving talk back to former issue
Upshot	upshot	To shortly state the consequences of what one has just said
Visual Presentation	vpres	Informing about visually evident information

2. Receipt Markers and Checking Moves

Acknowledge	ack	Unless sign of acceptance is clearly stronger then this is basic coding that shows message receipt
Accept	acc	Signal a strong positive response to what has been said
Agree	ag	Expressing a shared view with another
Check	chk	To elicit a signal that one is being properly understood
Clarification request	clfyR	Asking for a previous inform or something that is supposed to be

		understood to be explained
Clarification	clfy	Response to the above that at least seeks to make a previous inform clear
Confirmation request	confR	To check that the speaker means what you think he means
Confirmation	conf	To accept the interpretation in the recipient's confirmation request
Self Clarify	selfclfy	Own response to one's clarification request
Upshot Confirmation Request	upshot confreq	Making a candidate guess at the meaning of another's talk and seeking confirmation that this guess is correct

3. Moves Connected with the Decision Making Cycle

Alternative Decision Proposal	altDP	Putting forward an alternative course of action, once one has been put forward
Accept	acc	Signal that a decision proposal is met with approval
Decision Proposal	DP	Putting forward a

		course of action to the group
Directive DP	dirDP	A DP that is coded as an imperative for force
Elicit Decision Proposal	elDP	To request a DP from another participant
Evaluate	eval	When Assessment is given that is neither clearly positive or negative
Negative Evaluation	neg ev	Give judgement that is not supportive
Negative Evaluation of Decision Proposal	neg ev DP	To give a negative evaluation of a DP
Neg Ev Support	neg ev supp	Giving support for an earlier negative evaluation of the situation or a DP
Other Support	OSupp	A statement in support of another's position
Positive Evaluation	posev	Showing positive regard for something
Problem	prob	Aspect of a situation requiring a solution
Procedural Decision Proposal	procDP	A DP linked to procedure in the

		meeting
Reject	rej	A response to a DP that does not endorse it
Reject Negative Evaluation	negev rej	Not accepting another's negative assessment of the situation or of a DP
Self Support	Ssupp	A statement in support of one's own position

4. Less common moves document design data

Account	account	To give an explanation of oneself in the talk.
Apologise	apol	To say sorry
Basis	basis	The grounds on which another act, an inform for example can be made
Comment	comm	Additional non essential item of information
Common Ground	cg	Talk that draws on shared experiences of the speaker and one or more other participants
Concession	conc	To accept part of another's argument
Contrast	contrast	To comment on one thing in the light of its differences with

		another
Elicit Evaluation	el ev	To seek evaluation
Give permission	give per	Positive response to request for permission to do or say something
Greet	greet	Initial words on seeing someone you know
Introduce	intro	To tell one person the name of another who is present
Joke	joke	Make comment to initiate laughter
Offer	offer	Ask someone if they want something
Other Complete	Ocomp	To complete a piece of talk started by another
Permission Request	per req	Looking for permission to proceed in a certain way in the meeting from another participant
Seek Common Ground	cg sk	Look for shared opinions to safely share with another
Suggest	sugg	A proposed action that is not linked to a decision proposal

CHAPTER 3 REGISTER GENRE AND DISCOURSE

What follows is an attempt to survey the relevant research done in the related fields of genre, register and discourse analysis. First of all a detailed examination is made of the theoretical frameworks of both register and genre analysis. This is followed by a review of some of the research carried out in these fields and of some of the work done on discourse analysis that could usefully inform the study of genre and register.

3.1 Register

Halliday and Register

Register is the study of language according to the uses to which it is put. It is a term central to systemic linguistics. In Halliday's work there have been three main developments in the concept of register. These occur in Halliday, McCintosh & Strevens 1964, Halliday 1978 and Halliday and Hasan 1985. A review of these three will show the development of Halliday's thinking and the accompanying change in the nature of register analysis as carried out in more detail, on a more practical level, by other practitioners over these years.

The 1964 Position

In 1964, systemic linguistics and functional grammar were in their infancy, discourse analysis not yet born. The 1964 description reads almost as a prelinguistic outline for what register analysis should be. Its focus is on forms but the nature of the manifestation of register is ad hoc, not yet systematised.

Halliday et al (1964) split language use into two types to provide an early definition of register.

> A dialect is a variety of language distinguished according to the user: different groups of people within the language community speak different dialects. It is possible also to recognise varieties of language along another dimension, distinguished according to use. Language varies as its function varies; it differs in different situations. The name given to a variety of language distinguished according to its use is 'register'.
> (Halliday et al 64, p.87)

This is a functional definition, use is the determining factor. In 64, this functional category of register was to be defined in terms of formal properties. `Registers differ ... primarily in form.' (Halliday et al, 64. p.88)

The example sentences given that belong to distinct registers are not however analysed in terms of their formal properties, nor is any account taken of the meanings contributed by them. Rather an appeal is made to native speaker intuition to recognise where such sentences as `an early announcement is expected' and `apologies for absence were received' might occur. Halliday et al seem to suggest that register is no more than appropriacy, a matter of stylistic choice rather than concerned with meaning.

> It is not the event or state of affairs being talked about that determines the choice, but the convention that a certain kind of language is appropriate to a certain use.
> (Halliday et al 64, p.87)

These differences manifest themselves through lexis and grammar. `Cleanse', Halliday et al (64) suggest puts us in the register of advertising, `probe' belongs to journalism. Halliday relies on his own native speaker intuition for this information and appeals to the reader's for support. No corpora were available then for systematic linguistic checking to see if such opinions were true or not. Collocation is another key feature of register analysis at this time. Halliday et al say that `mix well' belongs to the register of recipe whereas `mixes well' is more likely to be found in a testimonial. The focus is on form; it is the verb form choice of `mixes' over `mix' that is seen as the register indicator rather than the choice of meanings that the verb `mix' can carry which separate the two registers above. Another example given is that whereas kick is probably neutral with regard to register, `free kick' belongs to the register of football. This is hardly collocation at all but the formation of a fixed lexical item like goalpost or kickoff. If register is only going to list the lexical items belonging to each variety it will be of limited value as a tool for analysis. Halliday however is creating a central place in modern linguistics for this study of register.

> Registers are not special or marginal varieties of language. Between them they cover the total range of our language activity. It is only by reference to the various situations, and situation types in which language is used that we can understand its functioning and its effectiveness.
> (Halliday et al 64, p.89)

This is a grand claim for the centrality of register to linguistics; that it is only by recognising differences in the functions of language that we can understand how language works at all, and one that is not going to hold firm until a semantic element is introduced. In 1964 however, Halliday sees register as recognisable in formal properties. Examples have been given of lexical realisations of register. On grammar Halliday says;

> Purely grammatical distinctions between the different registers are less striking, yet there can be considerable variation in grammar also.
> (Halliday et al 64, p.88)

The example registers given are the same reliable trio; church service, newspaper headline and advertising. Despite the claim to centrality for register, that it applies to every use of language, the examples given in this early paper make use of very few. The grammatical instances given of these registers sound more like collocational occurrences than grammatical ones. Halliday et al use 'pioneers in self-drive car hire' as an example, and say that although these last four words can appear in other contexts it is 'the structural string' that is the register feature. A fixed string of grammatical items is as much collocation as a fixed string of lexical ones. No examples of regular occurrence of tense or type of clause is presented as being a register feature, nor of such a feature as a skewing of the occurrence of modality types.[1] At present there is no appeal to frequency study: fixed grammatical or lexical items indicate particular registers.

Still, Halliday et al (1964) realise that register analysis can only be at a very elementary stage without a great deal more linguistic analysis and 'large samples of textual material', corpora, being built. They also see the lack of available authentic data as a particular reason for the slow development of the analysis of spoken registers. They look forward to a description of 'the language of consultations between doctor and patient in the surgery', which will not be carried out until 1976 by Coulthard and Ashby. In the early nineteen sixties linguistics concerned itself largely with the study of language in general.[2] Under Chomsky's lead this would continue. What was required was a tool to generate all and only the grammatical sentences of a language. This is a non functional formal approach to linguistics, compared to which even these early descriptions of register can be labelled functional. What Halliday sets out to do, and he sees it as a much more difficult task than Chomsky's, is to discover how uses of language differ from each other in their choice of formal items.

> It is one thing to make a general description of English accounting, to a given degree of delicacy, for some or all the features found in some variety of the language.... It is quite another thing to find out the special characteristics of a given register: to describe for example the special characteristics of a given register.
> (Halliday et al 1964, p.90)

Given the inadequacy of textual material for formal descriptions of register to be made, Halliday et al still see progress as possible from the point of view of what he calls `institutional linguistics'. This appears to mean that there is enough intuitive evidence before our native speaker eyes to recognise the `major situation types to which formally distinct registers correspond'. (Halliday et al 1964, p.90). The roots of register analysis clearly lie very much in mutual trust and a lack of solid evidence. We must take the existence of register on trust and then the collection of data and the refinement of analytical tools will follow to allow us to define them formally.

Furthermore Haliday adds `others [registers] can be predicted and defined from outside language'

(Halliday et al 1964, p.90). This is on the one hand recognition of the important role situational features will play in the definition of registers and a way out of the temporary dilemma that although register is seen as a linguistic phenomenon the practical linguistic tools of analysis that would define individual instances are missing.

Halliday introduces a classification of register along three dimensions in 64. The categories he uses are field of discourse, mode of discourse and style. This latter gets changed to tenor but otherwise these three elements remain with us throughout the development of register study, though their definitions change somewhat. Field of discourse, Halliday states, `refers to what is going on: to the area of operation of the language activity' . Because there is no formally defined level of situation the description of field is somewhat obscure. In situations where language activity is paramount then field equals subject matter. Halliday adds;

> On this dimension of classification, we can recognise registers such as politics and personal relations, and technical registers like biology and mathematics.
> (Halliday et al 64, p.90)

However where language plays a small part in the activity then field equals the whole event. The example of `hoovering the carpets' is given. This description is to say the least unclear and becomes more entangled as Halliday tries to describe a situation such as washing up where the talk is on politics. I think it is fair to say that the theoretical framework at this time was not strong enough to account for all these different types of activity. Later versions of register theory do not talk in such vague terms of the register of mathematics. Nevertheless, the basic definition of field as the subject matter of the discourse is clear enough.

The second dimension is `mode of discourse'. In 1964 this was seen largely as differences between spoken and written language. At a greater level of delicacy registers such as advertising, sports commentary and sermons become recognisable through differences in mode. It is not necessarily the difference in subject matter, field, that distinguishes a sports commentary from a sermon, it is more likely to be the method of delivery. No linguistic detail is provided by Halliday et al (1964), yet this kind of classificatory framework has helped others to formalise their more practically oriented research. Examples are to be found in the coming section on practical applications of genre analysis.

The third dimension is `style'. This is first described as `relations among the participants'. This is a definition that holds up for later developments of the style dimension into tenor. This is then further described as a cline of features between colloquial and polite, which is narrower than mode in later reworkings of the model.

Haliday et al state;

It is as the product of these three dimensions of classification that we can best define and identify register.
(Halliday et al 64, p.93)

This is the lasting framework on which register analysis has been built. Definitions of the three components have altered with time as we shall see, but not the components themselves. With time the tri stratal model seemed to become at first more fixed than at this earliest stage and then looser again. In 1964 Halliday can write

The criteria are not absolute or independent; they are all variable in delicacy, and the more delicate the classification the more the three overlap. The formal properties of any given language event will be those associated with the intersection of the appropriate filed, mode, and style.
(Halliday et al 64, p.93)

Later it is almost a matter of dogma that the three dimensions are kept separate, that each realises different types of meaning. Here though, before the theory has been worked out in detail, it is enough to see the three levels together accounting for every register, without worrying overly which dimension accounts for what register feature. Indeed, from the practical analyst's point of view the usefulness of the field tenor mode split is that it accounts for all aspects of language use. No part of language use is excluded. The boundary between the three is fuzzy at some points but most importantly, nothing is outside the register net.

The 1978 Position in Language as Social Semiotic

There are various reworkings of Halliday's position on register through the 1970's but these appear most fully in Halliday 1978, particularly in chapters 6 and 7. His model for register is now much more complex. The fundamental change is to discuss register in terms of semantics rather than the lexico grammar. Register is now a set of meanings that 'the member of a culture typically associates with a situation type'. These meanings are still realised on the stratum of lexico-grammar. At the beginning of ch 6 Halliday discusses a number of key 'general concepts' all of which interlock in his 'sociosemiotic theory of language'.

A TEXT is 'the instances of linguistic interaction in which people actually engage'. In keeping with the central place assigned to semantics in this theory, text is 'what is meant'. It is 'the basic unit of the semantic process'. Or 'text can be defined as actualized meaning potential' (Halliday 1978, p109). Text is encoded in sentences but not constituted of sentences. Semantics is central with meanings realised through the lexico grammar.

SITUATION 'is the environment in which the text comes to life'. Halliday wants to deal in situation types, something more abstract, equivalent to 'social context'. Situation types are semiotic structures, constellations of meaning that constitute the culture. Social context in more practical terms is the information a hearer needs to make sensible guesses about what a speaker is going to mean. Halliday divides into three the information that is required by the listener to do this.

> The semiotic structure of a situation type can be represented as a complex of three dimensions: the ongoing social activity, the role relationships involved, and the symbolic or rhetorical channel.
> (Halliday 78, p.110)

These are recognisable updates of field, tenor and mode respectively. Halliday continues;

> Field, tenor and mode are not kinds of language use, nor are they simply components of the speech setting. They are a conceptual framework for representing the social context as the semiotic environment in which people exchange meanings.
> (ibid, p.110)

Field, tenor and mode are now semantic elements rather than lexico grammatical and are consequently elements of social structure. For Halliday society is definable in terms of what people can mean, realised largely through what they can say.

The centrality of REGISTER that was posited but unproven in 1964 is now being claimed again for register as a way of understanding Malinowski's concepts of context of situation and context of culture. Register is freed from merely predicting or classifying certain fixed forms as being register characteristic. It is not the forms now that are predicted but the meanings. Halliday sees register as the means of understanding the particular semantic systems that belong to any one situation.

> A register can be defined as the configuration of semantic resources that the member of a culture typically associates with a situation type. It is the meaning potential that is accessible in a given social context.
> (ibid, p.111)

A register is now seen as a cultural norm, rather than the property of individual native speakers. Lexico grammar might be the property of individuals but meaning is a societal phenomenon. The meaning options available in any register are realised in words and structures. This means that the study of register is bidirectional. One can predict the types of language that will be used if one knows enough of the particular instance of the social situation and conversely presented with the language of a social context one can constitute the meanings that belong, and from that the cultural identity of the register.

> A semantics of this kind [register] forms the interface between the social system and the linguistic system; its elements realise social

> meanings and are realized in linguistic forms.
> (ibid, p.115)

Above the level of register Halliday sees CODE. Code controls the availability of registers to members of a society. Speakers of some codes will have restricted access to the culture's registers. It is the concept of code, a term of Bernstein's, that brings Halliday to the level of subcultures.

> The code is actualised in language through the register... the codes transmit or control the transmission of patterns of a culture or a subculture.
> (ibid, p.111)

Halliday discusses subculture in terms of socialising the child at home, school and peer group but the concept will be discussed more widely here in the next section dealing with genre.

The major detailed differences in terms of register between this model and that of 1964 is the hook up that Halliday now proposes between field, tenor and mode, as situational categories, and the semantic types of meaning, ideational, interpersonal and textual. He sees a `systematic correspondence between the semiotic structure of the situation type and the functional organisation of the semantic system'. (ibid p.116)

This systematicity is new. Now Halliday says that changes in the situational category field will show up in different types of ideational meanings in the text, whereas changes in tenor will be manifest as different kinds of interpersonal meaning and changes in mode will be shown by differences in textual meanings, (for an itemisation of situational and corresponding semantic elements see Halliday 78, p.117, table 2). To be fair to Halliday he uses the word `tendency' to describe the relationship between situational and semantic components. This is not all or nothing but a matter of statistical frequency. However although stated as proven fact, these tendencies remain very much as hypotheses that need testing on authentic data - a feature consistently lacking from Halliday's own writings.

The consequence of this is that research that looks for sociocultural elements of a register is simultaneously involved with checking the validity of Halliday's hypotheses about this large scale situational-semantic hook up. It seems that the whole theory of text as the key marker of social semiotic in language, and register as the marker of social situation types belonging to a culture and realised through language does not ultimately depend on the discreet packaging of situation and semantics into three elements that match one to one. Indicators of social semiotic are recognisable without this close link. Nevertheless the power of the theory of language as an inter-organism phenomenon, turning sociolinguistics into core linguistics relies heavily on the predictive power that this hook up posits.

Fifteen years on the theory still lacks proof.

Halliday is seen as the father of systemic linguistics and many people carry out research using the Hallidayan model but no incontrovertible evidence has been produced as proof of the theory. Nevertheless it is the key semantic areas that Halliday postulates as belonging to the ideational, interpersonal or textual that have been the focus of much systemic and non systemic textual analysis; modality and mood for the interpersonal, process type and transitivity for the ideational and ellipsis, reference and conjunction for the textual element.

The 1985 Perspective

The main theory holds from Halliday 1978. Halliday and Hasan (1985) is an undergraduate textbook on linguistics that both simplifies and moderates some of the claims made in Lang as Social Semiotic. Berry (1980) was a sytemicist's stringent attack on the Hallidayan method - no examples to support theoretical points, a lack of hypotheses and a clouding of the difference between proven and hypothetical statements. Without referring directly to this attack, in Halliday & Hasan (1985) an attempt is made to show in a number of textual examples how semantic and situational components hook up. One might charge Halliday with cooking the books, only providing examples that neatly match his theory. Berry (1980) demands that Halliday not only provide examples of feature A occurring when feature x occurs, which Halliday does here, but that he should also provide examples of feature A not occurring when X doesn't occur. There are no such examples given by Halliday.

There is no direct reply by Halliday to his critics. In Halliday & Hasan (1985), however, Halliday does seem to moderate his claims for how semantic and situational elements are linked. Instead of suggesting that each semantic/ situational component hook up is realised discretely Halliday now emphasises that all three elements of meaning, ideational, interpersonal and textual are interwoven and inseparable.

> These strands of meaning are all interwoven in the fabric of the discourse. We cannot pick out any one word or phrase and say this only has experiential meaning, or this only has interpersonal meaning.
> (Halliday and Hasan 85, p.23)

Instead he says each piece of text needs to reanlaysed in a different way to highlight each different component. This seems an adequate response at least to Berry's demands for hypothesis testing, although even more sustained exemplification would be welcome.

Halliday also clarifies the nature of register realisation. In the 64 model realisation seemed to be in terms of fixed phrase or lexical item alone. In 78 Halliday focusses on meaning at the expense of lexico grammatical realisation. Now he clarifies the situation by claiming that there are two ways in which register is realised; through typical and indexical features. Indexical features are the type first offered in the 64 model, collocations and fixed phrases. Typical features on the other hand are the forms that frequently realise any particular semantic element of a register.

In Halliday 1979 we see Halliday starting to move away from the discreet realisation position. He explains how ideational, interpersonal and textual elements of meaning all have different modes of realisation in the text. This is a more detailed explanation of the need for multiple analysis of text than that given in the undergraduate text book (Halliday & Hasan 1985). Halliday states in block capitals;

> Each of these semantic components typically generates a different kind of structural mechanism as its output.
> (Halliday 79, p.61)

According to Halliday experiential meanings 'are typically realised as elemental structures'. The encoding of experience typically requires such elements as Actor, Goal, Extent or Manner and such items typically 'form constituent-like structures'. Interpersonal meanings on the other hand are realised in a 'prosodic' manner. Expressions of epistemic modality - speaker certainty/ uncertainty is an area marked by Halliday as interpersonal and this can be 'strung throughout the clause as a continuous motif'. As in the concocted example;

I wonder if perhaps it might be measles, might it d'you think?
(ibid, p.66).

Textual meaning is recognised in waves, periodically. Halliday uses the example of the importance of both initial and final position in the clause for message structuring, while in between textual meanings are not being realised.

It would be optimistic to say as Gregory (1980) does that these later works adequately clarify Halliday's theory of register but as a sociolinguistic theory it survives with a far smaller degree of formal proof than would Chomskyan linguistics. Mentalist theories of language needed near 100% validity; once the real world is allowed in a far greater degree of uncertainty and fuzziness must be tolerated.

3.2 GENRE ANALYSIS

Genre is a more recent area of study in linguistics than register, in part a development from initial work done on register. Several different approaches coexist with varying foci. A great deal more practical analysis seems necessary before the theoretical framework for a linguistic approach to genre is determined. It is less easy to survey genre studies historically as they are all so recent and tend to overlap. The main linguistic approach to genre analysis has come from the Sydney school spawned by Halliday.

R. Hasan

Hasan's views on genre relate most closely to the Hallidayan view of Language as a Social Semiotic and are presented in detail in Halliday & Hasan 1985. In this book Hasan claims, or rather takes for granted that register and genre are one and the same thing. Nevertheless, the way in which she describes genre makes it sound quite different. In her diagram of culture, meaning and situation (ibid, p.100) she labels genre as meaning `one calibration of values of field, tenor and mode'. This could be a Hallidayan definition of register. At the end of this chapter on the subject of complete and incomplete texts Hasan also says

> In effect then, what one is saying is that the features, the factors, which allow us to judge whether or not a text is complete are essentially the same features that also allow us to identify its register, ie genre.
> (ibid, p.109)

As we will see later, Martin puts genre on a semiotic level above register, while Halliday, Montrose and Fawcett see genre as a subcomponent of register. Hasan however, does not explicitly differentiate between the two; both are configurations of field, tenor and mode, each of which is defined exactly according to Halliday. Nevertheless, the description of generic elements in text is quite different to that found in register analysis. The key aspects of genre as outlined by Hasan are as follows.

Hasan calls specific values of field, tenor and mode in combination a `Contextual Configuration' or CC. Examples given are parent praising child in speech or employer blaming employee in speech. Any change in field, tenor or mode alters the CC. Hasan then has a dynamic view of changes of field, tenor and mode developing within a text. For Halliday one feels that the dynamic / synoptic split is less important. Whole texts are seen as belonging to a single register and thus the analysis is usually a synoptic one of the completed text.

Hasan, then, uses the CC as an element of text structure, whereas Halliday tends to see meanings belonging more discretely to field, tenor or mode. For Hasan the CC is realised by the interaction of all three. Hasan uses CCs to make predictions about text structure. The kind of text she uses are where `language is doing some job in some context', where language is the `verbal expression of a social activity'. The predictions are

1. What elements MUST occur
2. What elements CAN occur
3. Where MUST they occur
4. Where CAN they occur
5. How Often can they occur

Thus the notion of CC allows the prediction of obligatory elements, optional elements and restrictions on placement and reiteration. In this model a complete text is likely to consist of several register shifts, each one a new CC realising a different element of social activity. Hasan like Ventola uses the example genre of service encounter. She produces the following combination of CCs which together give the genre, short for genre structure potential (GSP), of this type of social activity which takes place in language.

[(G). (SI)^] [SE.) {SR^ SC^} ^S^] P^PC(^F)
(ibid, p.64)

Where	SI = sale initiation	SR = sale request
	SC = sale compliance	SE = sale enquiry
	S = sale	P = purchase
	PC = purchase closure	F = finis

and
the caret sign ^ = sequence, round brackets = optionality, a dot = more than one option in sequence and square brackets indicate the restraint on this sequence choice. The arrow shows reiteration and the braces with a curved arrow `indicate that the degree of iteration for the elements within the braces is equal'. Hasan claims that GSP is a powerful device in that it allows within its confines the production of a large number of quite different texts. Yet Hasan says that if the obligatory elements are all present and sequencing rules obeyed then the text in question belongs to the genre of service encounter. This is a bottom up approach to register analysis where the presence or absence of language specific items is the determining feature of text genre. Other approaches to genre analysis from outside the Sydney school

tend to be top down. Generic features of text types are intuited or arrived at through rhetorical or sociological analysis. Language is looked at for hypothesis support and the range of exponents that may occur.

One can see that using the building blocks of field, tenor and mode out of which Halliday created register, Hasan is building a different kind of text structure. Register doesn't consist of a number of separable elements nor is it realised in time as the unfolding of text in a certain more or less controlled order. Genre then has a dynamic quality, takes place in real time and the achievement of a social activity is emphasised. Thus on one level register and genre are the same thing, they are composed of the same semantic elements but they are being put together and analaysed in a different way. Just as Halliday saw the need for the re-analysis of any stretch of text in terms of first ideational, then interpersonal and finally textual meanings, so the whole constellation can be reanalysed in connection with surrounding text with related but different field, tenor and mode values to create genre analysis.

Hasan comments on her own theorising;

> I tried to show that the structure of a text is closely related to the context of situation, so much so that the specific values of field, tenor and mode, which together make up a contextual configuration, can be used to make certain predictions about the structure of the

> text, just as the unfolding structure of the text itself can be used as a pointer to the very nature of the contextual configuration
> (ibid, p.70)

The relationship between text and CC is two way, each one helping to define the other, just as for Halliday register was a two way interface between social situation and the lexico-grammatical exponents. For Hasan, text and context are closely related in the way Halliday describes but in addition, text/context plus `the unfolding nature of the text itself' are the units of genre.

In the last chapter of Halliday & Hasan (1985), Hasan poses the question

> How far does the identity of a genre extend? What criteria would we use for establishing generic identity? ...
> (ibid, p.97)

and also

> What features of the text can be varied to allow the construction of variant texts, without varying the genre?
> (ibid, p.98)

The kind of problem Hasan is dealing with is how to theoretically allow a service encounter where for example, celery is bought, and one where peaches are bought, ie there is a small change in field, to coexist as part of the same genre. At the same time however, a face to face service encounter needs assigning to a separate genre from dropping an order in at the grocer's. How can the first examples be kept as part of the same genre and the latter two separated?

Hasan realises that to some extent every instance of a service encounter is different while at the other extreme there is something in common for all forms of talk. Where and how does one draw a line to talk of text genres? Hasan's answer to this is that we need to use her concept of generic identity; that genre is created by the presence of obligatory elements in a permitted sequence. As these elements are semantic a wide range of possible lexical realisation is allowed. This should be the cut off point in delicacy for genres. `A genre is known by the meanings associated with it.` Genre analysis then is a matter of recognising common meanings being realised in text and of recognising that different meanings co-occur in a restricted set of sequences and in the environment of a restricted set of other meanings, which may or may not occur, without causing a change of genre.

Hasan's was the first work on genre to come out of the Sydney school but more recently there has been additional work by J.R. Martin and Eija Ventola.

J.R. Martin

Like Halliday and Hasan, Jim Martin is also part of the Sydney School of linguistics and has written regularly on register and genre. Martin (1983a) is a study of register in which the author is already looking for a semiotic layer above register. Here he chooses code, following Bernstein and Halliday. The article deals with the language used by children of different ages to tell a story and Martin attempts to separate out the variables; text, register and code. The telling of the story counts as the genre inside of which the variables can be recognised. Martin here is subsuming genre as a part of register. He sees that register analysis must take account of text type. In 1983a Martin sees text type as genre and as functional tenor.

> In addition to field, mode and personal tenor register must be analyzed from the point of view of functional tenor or genre. All the tasks make use of narrative of vicarious experience.
> (Martin 1983a, p.10)

Gregory was responsible for splitting the category of tenor into two. Personal tenor still dealt with interpersonal relations in the text while functional tenor was created to account for the purpose of the text. What Gregory saw as part of tenor, Halliday saw as part of mode and called it `rhetorical mode', meaning I think, something like text type; narrative, exposition, or poem

Halliday himself has had little to say about genre. In Halliday (78) one can find;

> The generic structure is outside the linguistic system; it is language as the projection of a higher level semiotic structure. It is not simply a feature of literary genres; there is a generic structure in all discourse.
> (Halliday 1978, p.134)

Halliday's position on genre is undeveloped. Having seemingly dismissed genre study he then claims all language use has generic structure. Back in 1978 at least, just as Halliday saw the context of culture as being unmanageable; genre too was beyond the scope of linguistics and for the same reason. Halliday wanted more work done on manageable levels first. Halliday arguably does see genre as a higher level semiotic, above language, and this seems to be part of the reason for excluding it from linguistic study. Equally clearly Halliday does not view register as a connotative semiotic but as the interface between language and situation. Having appeared to place genre outside of register or language study, a few pages on Halliday finds a place for generic structure within his register system.

> The concept of genre discussed above is an aspect of what we are calling the mode.
> (Halliday 1978, p.145)

As Gregory subsumed genre into functional tenor, Halliday tries to place it within mode. One of the weaknesses of register study is the difficulty that even linguists belonging to the same school have in deciding where to assign types of meaning. Halliday recognises that assigning genre to mode is not a simple fit.

> A genre may have implications for other components of meaning: there are often associations between a particular genre and particular semantic features of an ideational or interpersonal kind... Hence labels for generic categories are often functionally complex.
> (Halliday 78, p.145)

The confusion in the positions Halliday takes regarding genre seem to me to arise out of a confusion between text type and genre. Text types such as narrative, exposition, instruction or sonnet may well be assigned to a sub component of register, be it mode or functional tenor. When, however, Halliday sees genre as `outside the linguistic system' and as `a higher level social semiotic structure' shaping all discourse, not just literary, then I think he has switched to a view of genre that is less concerned with form, text type and more concerned with a regular shape to the creation and unfolding of meaning units.

Martin, is looking for ways to tackle these higher level semiotics. There is however no recognition by him or Ventola that there may be something different between text type registers such as narrative and social semiotic registers such as a service encounter or an academic article introduction.
The results of Martin's register study (1983a) show

that different aged children have access to different codes, as shown by the different degree of contextual dependency in their narratives. Martin also discovers different genre awareness in the children. Older children recognise the fable as a particular kind of story and thus tell it in a different way to other narratives. Martin subsumes both these systematic semantic variations under the heading of code, realised through shifts in register which are realised through such language areas as reference and conjunction. Already Martin has the basics of his three tiered semiotic for genre which is revealed in Martin 84.

In this article (Martin 1984), Martin no longer talks about code but sees genre as the highest level semiotic. He equates register with Malinowski's context of situation, much as Halliday had done in Halliday (1978), and goes further to equate genre with context of culture. This is the plane that Halliday (1978) had called `a fiction, something we cannot hope to describe'. Martin uses a Hallidayan framework but takes the semiotic approach a step further than Halliday himself was prepared to do. Martin is not dealing with register as an interface between text and situation but with culture; culture being the set of meanings available to the members of a society. Cheepen and Monaghan (1990) describe culture in the following way, that I think Martin, Hasan and Halliday would all agree with. Indeed it is reminiscent of Halliday's earliest descriptions of register.

A description of a culture should provide what

> a stranger to a society would need to know in order to perform appropriately in the situations that a culture provides.
> (Monaghan and Cheepen 90, p.28)

When culture is equated with a set of meanings in a society then just as Hasan has described genre as unfolding social activity, so Martin sees genre as the name for these culturally defined types of behaviour. Martin gives a definition of genre;

> For us a genre is a staged, goal oriented activity in which speakers engage as members of a culture... Virtually everything you do involves your participating in one or another genre.
> (Martin 84, p.25)

Examples given include making a dentist's appointment, buying vegetables, applying for a job, inviting someone for dinner. These are recognisably similar to Hasan's service encounter although seeming a stage more delicately realised than Hasan's, who I think would stop at making an appointment, and buying things as her genres. All however are unfolding social activities where something gets done primarily through the medium of language. Other examples given by Martin however are poem, novel, writing an essay, or telling a story. These examples seem closer to text type, or Halliday's rhetorical modes than staged, goal oriented activities. There seems to be a confusion between the new linguistic definition of genre and the old literary notions of genre which are very much form based, rather than meaning based. One cannot talk of a set of achieved meanings that belong to a novel, essay or poem.

Martin lists two ways in which his model of language and register, though based on Halliday, is different. Firstly Martin sees register now as a semiotic system in its own right. Halliday saw language as a semiotic system and register as a constellation of language meanings but not as a semiotic system. The sort of questions that register as a semiotic should be able to answer include

> What exactly is the set of institutions in which we participate? What is the range of roles we can adopt with respect to other speakers? What is the nature of the channels we can use to convey our message?
> (ibid, p.24)

Such questions do not seem particularly different to ones Halliday might have asked of register. Perhaps when further research delivers the answers we will see more clearly the kind of differences Martin has in mind. Research into these semiotic areas is, admittedly, at a very early stage.

Secondly, above register, and also as a semiotic system, Martin puts genre. Both genre and register Martin calls `connotative semiotics', after Hjelmslev, because neither of them can make their own meanings but have to rely on language.

Martin uses the service encounter as an extended example of the functioning of a genre, which is entirely in keeping with Hasan's model outlined above. In a later article, Martin (1985), we see some split between Martin and Hasan and more common ground between Martin and Eija Ventola, who has done the most detailed work on the service encounter genre, thus allowing her to question Hasan's theoretical position on the nature of GSP from the viewpoint of the practical analyst.

Genre is now defined as `how things get done when language is used to accomplish them'. (Martin 1985, p.250) Again emphasising the social action aspect developed in Martin 1984 and Halliday & Hasan 1985. Martin continues

> The term genre is used here to embrace each of the linguistically realised activity types which comprise so much of our culture. Its meaning extends far beyond its use in literary studies to refer to different kinds of verbal art, though each of these does remain a genre in the usage here.
> (Martin 84, p.250)

Thus there is no change in the position regarding literary genres, what I call text type genres, but it is genre as cultural activity type that is developed in Martin's and Ventola's work. Martin is expanding the scope of genre without rejecting earlier types. Genre should now be able to account for why certain combinations of field, tenor, and mode, still seen as the raw ingredients of genre, are used by a culture and others not. In other words genre can be used to understand the culture of a society, what can and cannot be done, what is and isn't done. Genre can highlight a society's taboos; when and where for example sex is an acceptable topic. A second function of genre is to illustrate the stages that social activities go through.

> All genres have a beginning - middle - end structure of some kind.
> (ibid, p.251)

Martin calls these schematic structures and says they are the same as what Hasan calls Contextual Configurations in Halliday &Hasan 1985. However, according to Martin, whereas for Hasan, CCs are determined by configurations of field, tenor and mode, for him the process works the other way. These elements and register are constrained and generated by the genre in use. Martin finds more differences between his own position and Ventola's, who uses Martin as a theoretical base, and that of Hasan's. They are less sure of Hasan's notion of restricted sequence, finding examples of texts that appear to function properly as members of the service encounter genre yet which do not match Hasan's sequencing rules. They complain that there is recursion too, whereas the earlier version of Hasan's theory does not allow for this. However her 85 model does take Ventola's criticisms into account. Thirdly, Ventola discovers a number of places where the customer can opt out of the genre. This leads to a need for a more dynamic formation of genre structure. Ventola proposes the use of flow charts. This allows speakers the choice to abort the genre at certain places, allows for recursion and for different sequences of enactment. Martin calls this a dynamic system rather than a synoptic one. Although this point is not made by Martin it seems to me that register can be viewed as the synoptic system, something static without the give and take of interaction and development over time that is the added element of genre given by Hasan, Martin and Ventola.

Eija Ventola

Ventola's own work separates itself from Hasan in yet more ways.
She sees essential differences between CCs. Some of them are role related and need only one participant to carry them out, such as sale or sale request. Others are cooperative and require interaction from both participants, greeting or sale enquiry for example. For Ventola, these latter CCs need to be dealt with in a way that manifests their cooperative nature and she suggests the adjacency pair. Thus we see Ventola introducing the need for some form of discourse analysis as an aspect of genre study. This particular development will be taken up in the next section.

Partly because the presence of obligatory elements does not seem genre defining to Ventola and Martin and partly because of their concern to show the process of genre rather than genre as a static end product they find a different solution to the problem of demarcating genre. They produce networks of genre agnation to show a range of interconnected genres or sub genres and then list the genre structure elements, Hasan's CCs, that are essential to each. This would appear to allow for much greater accuracy in defining a very wide range of genre types than does Hasan's indelicate solution of requiring CCs to be present in a certain order. Ventola provides weaker constraints on sequencing too, using flow charts to map all the possible routes through a genre activity.

As Butler (1989) points out;

> Martin, Ventola and their colleagues recognise that they are only at the beginning of what promises to be a very exciting programme of research into genre. One aspect which as Ventola (1987: 87) admits needs much clearer definition is the relationship between genre networks and flow charts, and in particular the way in which they interact to constrain the choices in register appropriate to a given stage in the discourse.
> (Butler 89, p.17)

The study of genre is still new and hard and fast theoretical positions have not yet been taken up. As Butler points out, Ventola and Martin do not solve all their problems by seeing genre and register as connotative semiotics above language. Such a theoretical stance needs to show more clearly how register and genre interact. Hasan on the other hand uses genre and register sometimes to mean the same thing but then explains genre in quite different terms. Although Hasan herself does not say so I think her position is explainable in systemic terminology. Genre and register are looking at the same object, a kind of text. Register views it synoptically and genre is an attempt to view it dynamically.

The theoretical developments made by Martin and Hasan have breathed new life into register analysis. The Sydney school insistence on the dynamic quality of genre is leading to different types of analysis being carried out than have previously been the case in register analysis. If there is a weakness to the Sydney School Approach it is perhaps in their desire to make genre analysis as tight a fitting set of interlocking systems as systemic linguistics has developed for grammar. A looser, more ad hoc approach to genre that takes account of Sydney school work, and sees genre as existing on the context of culture but which takes a much looser and more pragmatic approach to genre analysis is to be found in the work of John Swales.

John Swales

Swales approaches genre analysis from the perspective of the ESP teacher wanting to teach advanced university students, not necessarily advanced students of English, how to construct academic articles, research papers in English. In his book Genre Analysis (Swales 1990) he summarises concepts of genre held by literary studies, folkloristics, linguistics, including those of Martin and Halliday, and rhetoric. He then offers his own five point working definition of genre.

1. A genre is a class of communicative event.

Not many would argue with this. Swales's aim here is to limit the field to those events where language plays a key role.

2. The principal criterial feature that turns a collection of communicative events into a genre is some shared set of communicative purposes.

So not all communicative events are genres. This second element should remove casual conversation from the list of generic activities. Swales also wants to remove narrative from the list. This indicates a difference between Swales and Martin who is keen to include traditional literary and rhetorical genre types within his definition although the analytical work done is on social action genres, which fits in well with what Swales is describing here.

3. Exemplars or instances of genres vary in their prototypicality.

Swales tries to solve this problem philosophically rather than linguistically. He admits that he is trying to avoid the trap of too tight a definition of genre and too loose a description of text families. What Swales does not do is try to lay down linguistic criteria for genre recognition / definition in a way that Hasan or Martin do.

4. The rationale behind a genre establishes constraints on allowable contributions in terms of their content, positioning and form.

Without going into detail Swales sees genre as semantic, a set of meanings, and as constrained in terms of sequence and structure. How tight the sequencing constraints are would appear to depend very much on the genre in question. Swales also sees form constraints; a point underplayed by the Sydney School who stress semantics and social semiotic. Both Hasan and Swales define genre elements in terms of semantics, but as Swales indicates this should not preclude some limitation on lexico-grammatical realisation. Classification of genre type is not a prime objective, Swales is more concerned with applications.

5. A discourse community's nomenclature for genres is an important source of insight.

This too is a practical stance. To some extent genre is a conscious social activity, genres are not going on behind peoples' backs, at least not behind the backs of those who belong to the discourse community that makes use of that genre. As a genre develops one can expect to find a society name for it. This societal feature of genre also de-emphasises the need for genre defining analysis; the inferred emphasis should be on what genres achieve for their users and how.

This is genre defined in a much less linguistic way compared with Martin, Ventola and Hasan who are obliged to build genre into the conceptual armory of systemic linguistics. Swales's definition is one that invites further study, which clearly genre analysis needs, but study of the force and function of genre rather than preoccupation with form and semiotic structure.

When Swales describes the genre elements of the research article introduction, however, he uses terms which are in tune with Martin's conception of genre as a higher semiotic than register, whose meanings are general and culture determining: `establishing a territory', `establishing a niche`, `occupying the niche'. These fit well with the Sydney School concept of genre as unfolding social action.

One would like to see research into genre directed as Swales suggests, away from preoccupation with classification, but coupled with the Sydney school linguistic approach. It seems a misdirected effort by Ventola and Martin to use discourse analysis to only show genre structure, and not very successfully, and not to emphasise genre meaning and function. The genre they are concerned with is strong on structural elements and weak on meaning. The genre elements are comparatively clear cut and the chase is on to find what sort of linguistic analysis can best identify them and then be used to recognise more complicated genre structure. This is genre classification analysis. When Ventola does turn her analysis to highlight the meanings of the service encounter the results are trite and obvious. What is needed is a more complicated genre with less clear genre elements, such as the research article introduction for example, so that linguistic analysis might find more point in uncovering meanings and functions than in establishing a genre classificatory system.

3.3 A SURVEY OF PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS OF GENRE AND REGISTER ANALYSIS AND THEIR LINKS WITH DISCOURSE ANALYSIS.

What follows is an attempt to survey the kinds of research done in the name of register and genre analysis. The survey is by no means complete but aims to show how register analysis took little note of the discourse level of language while linguistic approaches to genre have claimed a central place for such an approach.

Register Analysis

Butler (1985), is very thorough in his review of systemic linguistics, both practical and theoretical. On register he recommends the work of Ellis and Ure (1969), Chiu (1973), Hasan (1973), Gregory and Caroll (1978), and Halliday (1978). Some of the above have been mentioned as developers of theoretical views of register; the remainder plus others, those who have undertaken more practical analysis in the seventies and eighties will be examined here.

The earliest work on register was carried out by Jean Ure and her associates starting in the late sixties, (see Ure 1971). She seeks to discover the linguistic qualities of language in action - as described by Malinowski. Her aims are to discover useful qualities of this register which will then be available for the production of teaching materials. From the outset a perceived application of register analysis was for English teaching purposes. Halliday's earliest exposition of the subject (1964) was in a book entitled `The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching'.

Ure's approach is linguistic and concerned with forms rather than meaning. She recognises that language in action has a high ratio of grammar words to lexical content words and devises the measure of `lexical density', which is the percentage of words with lexical properties in any text out of the total of orthographic words. This was an astute observation and lexical density has remained current in language analysis since Ure's time until the present. Halliday (1986) still uses it as a rough analytical marker of spoken or written texts. Ure's study links situational features of language use with this measure of lexical density, a type of lexical analysis.

Although the analysis is strictly formal, taking no account of the function of any particular item in context, Ure does give explanations for the lexical density variable in situational terms. The analysis does show that situational context has a regular effect on language forms. Ure provides early evidence that the systemic school of thought on language is not just empty theory. Lexical density is found not just to vary according to the choice of spoken or written mode but also according to the possibility of providing feedback or not, and to the extent of preparedness on the part of the speaker/ writer.

Another early key work was that of Chiu (1973). She too is using register analysis to aid the teaching of English. Register analysis should be able to divide the language whole into manageable parts which can be defined according to linguistic properties.

> When we observe language activity in the various contexts in which it takes place, we find differences in the types of language selected as appropriate to different types of situation.
> (Chiu 73, p.54)

These differences again are not in terms of meanings but linguistic form. Chiu builds a corpus of letters belonging to the register of administration. The corpus is then subdivided into sections which are semantic, according to the purpose of the correspondence; to authorize, inform, send, request etc. From this analysis which focusses on the verb phrase a list of lexical verbs was made in order of frequency of occurrence for each sub section. These lists were then compared with general frequency lists with interesting results. For the corpus as a whole, after `be', `have' and `make' the most frequent verbs were `attach', `enclose', `receive', `require' and `appreciate'. None of these verbs occurs in the top two hundred for general frequency. This surely had useful application for the teaching of business letter writing in English to overseas students. Chiu's study of forms went further. She recognised the most common forms of occurrence of all these most common verbs and discovered that they were more often marked for voice and mood than tense or aspect. Again this could have a teaching use. No attempt was made however to account for this linguistic analysis in terms of the types of meanings necessary in business communication. Semantics was still outside the scope not only of register analysts but for most linguists at that time.

Along with Halliday in the mid seventies, applied linguists at Edinburgh, who were largely concerned with linguistics for language teaching, started to make claims about the need for a semantic component to register study. Davies (1976) opens his paper

> In this paper I argue first that neither language nor situation can stand alone in providing clues to meaning, second that study of register has underestimated the importance and difficulty of establishing underlying sociological and linguistic categories (particularly the former)...

(Davies 76, p.64)

Along with Halliday, Davies claims a central role for meaning and that meaning is only to be understood in terms of both form and situation. Register analysis is going to have to attend to sociological features in more depth and with greater accuracy in order to discover what kinds of meanings a particular situation is composed of. Davis makes a claim for the centrality of sociolinguistics

> The fact is that unless we are presented with the situation and the language we are in no position to say anything useful at all.
> (ibid, p.67)

Interesting comments about form alone will no longer do; form shows meaning but only when coupled with sociological analysis of situations.

Davies offers the register analyst a number of options. Firstly the surface approach, the language of Chomsky is still the currency of linguistics in 1977. That is for example to study the imperatives of trawler men or the like. Davies says this may well help for teaching purposes, but the implication is that it will not tell us much about what is really going on in any situation. For deeper approaches an interaction between sociology and linguistic categories is needed, as Labov and Bernstein both showed. Interestingly, Davies is still worried about the type of linguistic feature chosen by these two: Labov's phonology and Bernstein's grammar. Davies predicts that to get at social meanings it will be necessary to look at the `underlying linguistic systems', such as modality, cohesion and implication. Davies foresees the need for a discourse level approach for register study that is semantically and even pragmatically oriented.

Finally Davies gives a sample of the semantic register research on the language of science text books being carried out at Edinburgh. The research has discovered typical types of chemistry sentence, attributives and locatives. We have a register study of form and situation. The analysis goes a step further to give a semantic account for the presence of these features in chemistry; attributives are used to describe physical states and change of states while locatives are associated with chemical compounds and chemical changes. This allows the Edinburgh group to make greater claims for the centrality of such linguistic study for the purposes of learning an academic subject.

> The sorts of relationships with which any discipline deals are different in various ways from those of everyday life. This is why we can say with full seriousness that to learn chemistry is to learn the language of chemistry.
> (Taylor in Davies 76 p.75)

In the late seventies and eighties register analysis becomes more concerned with meaning and society.

Benson and Greaves (1981) is a good example. In the course of a paper which explains the importance of lexis as realiser of the register element field we find the following statements.

> Register allows us to share expectations of meaning.
> (Benson & Greaves 81, p.45)

And

> Field is that part of the social semiotic concerned with social actions within an institutional focus.
> (ibid, p.47)

Thus the purpose of register is now to reveal kinds of social meaning. One sees how Davies's demand for more concern with sociological aspects has been developed. What was once merely situation, a lay term is now `social action within an institutional focus'.

Register can reveal the nature not just of sermons, or advertising language but of all the social circumstances or institutions in which we lead our lives. Register analysis, even if not called by what has become a largely systemic term, or the linguistic analysis of communication in context, to half quote D Tannen (1986), who has a non systemic approach to this kind of sociolinguistics, is now seen as a way of understanding and possibly changing the nature of the most important institutions through which society functions.

Benson and Greaves still stress the educational value of register study but by the mid eighties the study of communication practices in education and health are seen as ways of improving interpersonal relationships within those institutions. For this however more of Davies's underlying linguistic systems will need to be used; how people exchange information, negotiate meanings and get things done in language. Discourse analysis will be necessary and indeed this is the prime tool in the eighties of studies in language in social contexts.

Very little discourse analysis however is used in studies, even in the eighties, that give themselves the name of register analysis. Elda Weizman's work is an exception. His paper starts;

> This paper deals mainly with the notion of discourse characteristics of registers and the question of their universality. It aims at emphasising the relevance of discourse analysis in the comparative study of registers.
> (Weizman 82, p.39)

If register analysis is about text and text is seen as a set of meanings only realised in the lexico grammar then the analysis of text as text, discourse analysis, and not just as groupings of lexical or grammatical items seems an obvious way to discover the nature of different text types occurring in social contexts. Weizman looks for the discourse meaning of quotation marks, their rhetorical function in and across types of text. Few other register studies use discourse analysis at all and least of all its most potent weapon, the analysis of conversational structure, discourse analysis as developed by Sinclair and Coulthard.

Studies continue that only show lexical features of such registers as sports or news reporting (Wallace 1981). Although such research now purports to be 'sociolinguistic' and is of some interest for its concern for how related registers differ, it hardly deals with meaning at all and deals safely with the statistical analysis of form occurrences. Ferguson (1983) does another register study of 'sports announcer talk' and though he claims it will be concerned with 'syntactic aspects of register', he does attempt to find meanings for the range of commonly occurring syntactic patterns. Ferguson does identify some form - function relations. Thus inversion is seeing as giving the hurried announcer more time to discover a player's identity. Unfortunately however there is too little of this and an insistence on how to identify a register formally rather than looking for its key meanings and ways of meaning.

By 1981 Young can entitle a paper 'Whatever happened to Register Analysis?' It appears to have dropped out of the vocabulary of language syllabus planners such as Munby and Widdowson, even though they were very much concerned with language use according to situation in their approaches to course design.

Perhaps the problem with register is that it had little to say about interactive uses of language and to this extent had marginalised itself. Such static concepts as field, tenor and mode are useful for categorising whole texts synoptically but less useful in interactive settings where their values maybe constantly changing. Register analysis has had rather little to say about non monologic discourse in fact.

The development of conversational analysis and then discourse analysis was largely parallel diachronically with register study but with very little overlap indeed. Even when Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) produced their system of discourse analysis and used teacher pupil interaction for context, no claim was made that discourse analysis would enhance register analysis,
no attempt was made to use discourse analysis as a component of register study. Discourse analysis has had to wait for the development of genre analysis in linguistics to be seen as a useful component in the study of language variation according to use and not just as a separate kind of study.

Following my interpretation of Hasan's theory of genre as register plus unfolding social activity one can see why. The aspect of unfolding social activity means that genre is dynamic while register static. Register can be solely paradigmatic as Halliday developed it, but genre is essentially both paradigmatic and syntagmatic. Much register analysis was on non interactive uses, sports announcing, journalism, and business correspondence, reflecting a lack of security where language was used interactively, where meanings were constructed by more than one participant. Genre on the other hand has focused, especially in the register oriented Sydney school, on interactive language used to achieve social purposes such as the service encounter. An examination of the dynamic ways that genre meanings are formed in text reveals how fundamental the switch between genre and register has been.

Genre and Language

In her most complete study of service encounters Ventola (1987) uses the following types of text analysis; conversational structure, lexical cohesion, reference and conjunction. All these are large scale basic communication systems that have developed along side the growth in discourse or text study, to handle the shift in core linguistic focus away from the sentence to discourse or text.

Ventola uses a model of discourse analysis that was first put forward by Halliday (1984) and modified by Martin (1985). It owes a lot to basic concepts of move and turn as developed by Sinclair and Coulthard and work done by Berry to sytemicise their early rank and scale approach. Ventola is thus able to draw a speech function network on the discourse stratum (Ventola 87, p. 92). This works as a basic pattern of exchange structure; whether exchanges are knowledge or action based and whether the exchange initiator is giving or demanding. Ventola finds regular patterns of exchange structure that are likely to co-occur with her genre elements. She finds typical realisations of greeting, service bid, service etc. There is no one to one correlation between discourse structure and genre element, just as there is no such relation between form and function at the syntactic level, yet the discourse analysis does indicate the likely sequence of functional units that constitute the genre element. Ventola is able to make a modest claim

> Conversational structure in service encounters does at least to a degree indicate the realisation of generic structure elements in the service encounter genre. But it seems clear that other supporting evidence for similarities of generic structures in texts is also needed. (Ventola 87, p.126)

Ventola's problem may be the same as earlier register analysts in looking for register defining features rather than using analysis to collate meanings associated with the genre in question. A concern with classification and sub classification may not be the most illuminating approach to genre analysis, leading as it would back to a focus on form and away from meaning. One feels that the powerful tool of discourse analysis, here the analysis of spoken interaction in sales encounters, is useful as a marker of sequential structure in different types of social interaction. Rightly Ventola wishes to see evidence of generic membership through other forms of analysis. I think she hopes to show generic features in text that are not sequential but semantic in nature. In this part of her study I believe she is less successful.

Alongside conversational structure, another strand of analysis used by Ventola is lexical cohesion. Lexis has been a constant aspect of systemic/ sociolinguistics since the time of Firth. Halliday and Hasan's study (76) 'Cohesion in English' is a widely used analytical tool, well beyond the circle of systemicists for the study of formal aspects of text. Hasan pioneered this method of analysis to talk about text structure and recognition of genre elements. Using the approach of Halliday and Hasan, Ventola states

> Once it is known what kind of cohesive devices are generally used to construct texts, then a hypothesis for text typology can be set up... Texts with similar lexical patterns are texts which are of the same type (genre, register).
> (Ventola 87 p.130)

This is only a hypothesis as it remains unproven by analysis. Ventola adds that the method of analysis will be Martin and Rothery's, (1980, 81) used to show how lexical cohesion realises register choice, especially field choices.

> As a text unfolds from a generic element to another, the field orientations in elements are hypothesized to be realised on the discourse

> stratum by lexical structures generated by the choices from the lexical cohesion system network.
> (Ventola 87, p.131)

This system looks to examine relations of hyponymy, meronymy and synonymy, along side extension and enhancement. Lexical relations shown by these systems should show a closer link within genre elements than between. Furthermore, the most commonly occurring lexical fields should give an indication of the field of the genre element.

On the whole, Ventola's evidence for this in her own data is unconvincing, the nature of a service encounter being too simple and straight forward perhaps to need the kind of clarification offered by lexical patterning analysis. Ventola herself concludes;

> Lexical strings reflect generic organizations in texts, but undeniably methodology for analysing how activity sequences are realised by lexical cohesion ... need improvement and elaboration so that the realizational links between lexical cohesion structure on the discourse stratum and the generic structures on the genre plane can best be captured.
> (ibid, p.146)

The analysis only seems to account for the most obvious points about the meanings in service encounters and Ventola seems more concerned to use the analysis as support for the systemic school claim for the links between the planes of genre, register and language. This is a formal, structural concern rather than a semantic one. The analysis is of more use to those who would prove the system than those who would uncover the semiotics of a service encounter. Ventola admits (ibid, p145-6) that lexical cohesion is better suited, as she has used it, to capture relations between objects, post office, jiffy bag etc, rather than features of the activity structure. One might conclude that lexical cohesion, as applied by Ventola at least, is a better component of a synoptically oriented approach to discourse type such as register than a dynamic one such as genre.

The justification for including reference as a likely genre defining semiotic is that reference structure should keep track of participants. In narrative for example, reference chains keep track of heroes. The genre elements in a service encounter however are so short that Ventola is forced to see the very lack of reference chains as genre specific and to conclude that 'further studies are needed to throw light on the phenomena of text reference', (ibid, p.163).

Ventola's final language system analysed for genre identity is conjunction. She seems to include in this category not only conjunction as explained by Halliday 85 but also the Sinclair Coulthard discourse feature of boundary marking, this latter being external and the other internal conjunction. After lengthy analysis Ventola concludes that boundary marking is also an uncertain guide to the recognition of genre elements and that conjunction can only lend support to the type of chunking shown by other systems.

These four systems of analysis are the exact same ones seen as central systems of discourse by Martin (1985). Having placed genre and register above the language level he then divides the language level into three; discourse, lexico grammar and phonology. Historically register only dealt with the latter two and genre largely with the first. The difference between genre and register as dynamic and static is part reason for this development but no reason for its continuation. Register could well use discourse meanings as a defining feature of a text variety product and genre study could well look for meanings carried by the lexico-grammatical level that would be genre element defining.

Ventola's work is carried out to support Martin's theoretical position; its findings however should encourage researchers to look for genre defining elements in other meaning systems of text than reference, cohesion and conjunction. In particular to look outside of grammar based systems such as conjunction and to develop new discourse based approaches rather than to build up to discourse using techniques that work for grammar.

Genre analysis is new and still requires a large effort simply to establish its structural features: the division and recognition of genre structure elements and the types of analysis that will achieve this. Too little attention is being paid at present to genre meanings. This is partly because the meanings of service encounter elements are relatively trivial. Though the service encounter may be a good choice for discovering sequential structure in genre it is unproductive at the level of semantic structure. Discourse systems should productively allow for the classification of genre according to meaning. Furthermore the meanings that need to be captured are precisely those of the activity structure, rather than the ones Ventola found of the object relations in the text.

The work done by Swales is more productive on the semantic level. By being less rigid linguistically and not solely focused on genre element structure, Swales has started to uncover the rhetorical structure of the research article. Rhetorical structure is relatable to the kind of meanings Martin sees genre generating on the context of culture strata; very general in nature and defining of what is and is not possible within a society or society group. It is at this level that Swales accounts for changes in importance of genre elements, the move away from methods to discussion is indicative of a change in the culture of science. This kind of approach will be followed up in the second part of this thesis that is concerned with Rhetorical Structure Theory.

Discourse Analysis and Genre

What follows will be a brief survey of work done in the field of discourse analysis. This is taken in its widest sense, not a narrow Birmingham school approach, but to include a number of approaches to the analysis of naturally occurring text in specific situations. The purpose of this is to highlight the range of meaning types in text that is thrown up by different text analyses that might well have uses in genre study. The work chosen is exemplary and eclectic rather than exhaustive of the options. I see the development of genre analysis in a pragmatic way. Whatever tool is suitable for the task in hand should be applied. Unlike the Sydney school approach, the methods need not be dictated in advance to accord with a theoretical stance. This may be an unprincipled stance but I hope it is one that leads to tangible results, in both sequential and semantic terms, for the data of this thesis.

Tannen (1986) looks at the nature of the information unit offered to medics by parents of handicapped children. She makes a tri-partite classification; elaborated, condensed or neither. This structural feature is also an aspect of meaning. What parents feel constrained to say in such interviews is part of what meanings can be achieved. On an interpersonal level Tannen's analysis could well be seen as a system network. If parents, with statistical frequency, make one choice or at certain points in the interview tend to make the choice of one kind of inform over the others then this seems a potential genre element defining feature (gedf from now on). One advantage of this approach would be that other related or agnate genres could be identified in terms of the presence or absence of such meaning systems or in terms of regularly occurring meaning choice within the system. This plus many other meaning system features would be found to be the collective marker of genre and of genre differences. Taking a line that stretches back to Saussure, it is only in recognising where sets of systems are different that one uncovers meaning.

Tsui (1989) examines the need for an obligatory third part in exchange structure. She decides that there are a range of meanings associated with the third feedback move and that its absence is a feature that needs accounting for. This sets up a system choice of +/- feedback which at the next stage of delicacy classifies the functions that feedback can have; evaluating, acknowledging, social oiling or mutual understanding marker. This too could be an interpersonal gedf. In classroom discourse for example feedback is largely used by only one participant, the teacher and its purpose is largely evaluative. This is a genre differentiator between classroom discourse and say committee talk. This is recognised by Coulthard and Montgomery (1981), but they are committed to a structural analysis rather than a semantic one. If, following Halliday (1974 onwards) we view texts as sets of meanings and set out to classify what meanings occur where, then Tsui's structural and semantic approach to discourse analysis should supply a number of potential gedfs.

Akindele (1986) is looking for markers of dominance in family conversation. Dominance is a type of meaning which has structural consequences for text. One marker is the frequency with which participants initiate exchanges. At a more delicate level one can find different types of initiation linked to dominant/ non dominant participants. This study is aimed at showing socio cultural patterns of interaction for a whole speech community but the analytical features could be used equally well in genre analysis. Dominance may well be a genre feature of certain kinds of professional talk, the classroom for example. If one can system network all the sub systems that account for dominance and see which ones are used in different teaching or non teaching situations this should help to separate a teaching genre from other social activities that teachers engage in or to separate out sub genres of teaching.

Coupland (1983) is looking for `discourse variables' of situation at a time before the currency of genre analysis. He calls his type of study `variation analysis' and uses Halliday's arguments on register and dialect as a theoretical basis for the research.

> The speech differences [in dialect] are relatively slight and superficial. What is of consequence is `the cultural or sub cultural environment as this is embodied or transmitted through the language'.. The language differences may be significant, but if so it is a difference of function rather than form.
> (Halliday 74 quoted in Coupland 83, p.460)

Once again the preeminence of meaning is emphasised and a claim is made for its centrality to variation study. Coupland draws a distinction between low level variation such as phonological or lexico - grammatical variables and discourse variables. I would suggest that both are available for variation / genre analysis, but that as more work has been done on the former, it is on the latter that work is needed in order to open up the range of potential available discourse variables that operate as systematic meaning choices for one variation or another. Coupland too is anxious for discourse variables to attain the same status as say Labov's phonological ones. Very much within the Birmingham school of discourse analysis Coupland identifies the following discourse markers of text variation. The presence or absence or boundary exchanges, plus a consideration of their function, the presence or absence of meta statements in the discourse and their function, and the explicitness of such discourse functions as request or elicit. Again the interlocking of such subsystems of interpersonal interaction may well be key elements in genre or sub genre definition.

Francis (1986) hopes to show that `the organisation of topicality and the production of `team talk' are features which distinguish negotiation management talk from ordinary conversation. If achievement of topicality can be constructed as a system of alternatives, each of which has a function then this too can be a gedf. Topicality, in the guise of topic type will prove a useful thread of analysis in the forthcoming chapters.

Greatbatch (1988) wants to differentiate news interviews from normal conversation and uses the analytical tool of constraint on turn taking. Interviewer and interviewee can be identified from the range of turn each carries out. This is not a feature of unmarked casual conversation. It may well prove to be a meaningful choice that in combination with others differentiates news interviews from other more closely related genres too. Conversation analysts are usually primarily concerned with the nature of everyday conversation, but people working in more systematic fields need not be so constrained.

Gill Francis (1989) poses this question in her paper;

> Can genres be distinguished from each other in terms of the information typically contained in the themes of their component clauses?
> (Francis 89, p.201)

Working from a systemic perspective Francis is looking for genre element defining features which are highlighted through grammatical analysis and a consideration of theme choice.

Starting from a Hallidayan view of clause structure (Halliday 1985), Francis analyses three related kinds of written discourse. She examines the news report, which is expected to use the news report genre, the editorial, which following Martin (1985) is expected to use the genre of analytical exposition and the letter of complaint, which is expected to use the genre of hortatory exposition. Francis takes a low level grammatical variable, clause type and links this to function, the theme position and initially finds some support for her hypothesis from her chosen text types. She uses two related types of analysis. One is clause type; is the theme material, mental, verbal, relational clause etc and secondly she uses lexical selection; are the themes typically people, institutions, concrete objects etc. The results not only show difference but the differences found are interpretable with a view to the meanings likely to be associated with each clause type. The news genre uses material and verbal clauses as themes and far fewer relationals. Again following Halliday (1987) this is a reflection of the lack of nominalisation in news, which is an indication that there is more ideation, more information content to these themes. This is to be expected perhaps in news, the functional analysis supports intuition.

Francis carries out a second type of analysis on her text types using the criterion of lexical density. This is a technique that has maintained currency since the sixties but is now being used as a meaning marker rather than a text situation marker. Lexical density is 'generally associated with a metaphorical and nominalised type of text' (Francis 89, p.204). The use of nominalisation appears to allow for evaluation and for textual coherence, in that any amount of previously given information can be encapsulated as part of the nominal group. News would have been expected to have lower lexical density than editorials, but the research shows otherwise. Either lexical density is not a good marker of nominalisation in all cases, or there are other functions of nominalisation that make it useful in a news text, or Martin's hypothesised genres, hortatory and analytical exposition, require further refinement or rethinking. In any case the functional study of clause as theme is worth further analysis. Francis claims 'more genre-oriented structural analyses are necessary' in order to discover more genre structures. Francis is widening the type of analysis being used to discover genre elements and consequentially opening up the range of text meanings that might have genre defining features.

Aronsson and Rundstrom (1989) look at pediatric discourse with the aim of using Brown and Levinson's politeness theory to reveal 'how discourse is a matter of continuous negotiation between participants.' (Aronsson & Rundstrom 1989, p.483). The discursive encoding of types of negotiation is a rich site for a sequential approach to genre analysis as the following chapters will demonstrate. Doctors are powerful participants and their method of formulating directives is one measure of this power. If they are not understood when making an indirect fta they make it more directly, they exercise their power in the professional situation more openly. This is not an option equally open to other participants in this discourse. Brown and

Levinson's taxonomy of fta strategies is a ready made system network that has structure and function. The frequency at which a powerful discourse participant chooses a certain type or a certain sequence of types of face threatening act may well be a distinguishing feature of power oriented discourse.

Summary

Above I have ransacked a number of different studies all in the area of discourse analysis. Some are grammar based, pushing up to discourse and some are pragmatic in nature. They are all studies of language in context, and reveal how the type of meanings that constitute these discourse settings is often open to classification as a system network. This network can then become part of a system of systems where regularly occurring sets of choices may well be descriptive of genre or register.

To the extent that there is an unfolding social purpose to the discourse, as in the service encounter, genre elements are definable. When this is more difficult as in talk with less clearly defined goals or multiple goals or where, as in the process of document design, the final goals are achieved only partially through oral negotiation, then recognition of genre structure elements becomes more difficult and an approach to genre will be needed that takes note of this difficulty and seeks genre defining features within the semantic structure of these events and not only in their sequential unfolding. An analysis of sequentially placed discourse meanings will be the starting point for this enquiry into register and genre features of the document design process.

The discourse analysis that develops over the next four chapters will be a method of analysis to suit the data, with categories of move designed to accommodate regularly occurring functional behaviour in the types of talk under consideration. This is in contrast to the Sydney school discourse analysis method which works with the very basic Hallidayan model first presented in Halliday 1980 and developed in Martin 1985. More will be said about this model in the following chapter where the basics of this thesis's discourse approach are produced. For now suffice to say that the breadth of discourse studies described above provide a range of analytical approaches that may support the recognition of genre elements in my document design data. Genre analysis has been developed by the Sydney school of Linguistics, but there is no requirement to be restricted to using their methods or framework. This thesis is a linguistically based approach to genre and consequently draws heavily on systemic work. It is also informed by work on business communication and rhetoric and will attempt to accommodate such work in its representation of document design talk. A linguistic basis for such representation will always be made. This thesis will try to take account of previous research on genre, discourse analysis and on professional communication. That said, its procedures and tools are unrestricted by such work. Genre analysis does not need a straight jacket it needs a regular input of new ideas. Of course these ideas must be credible and defensible but they do not have to fit existing patterns of approach to the study of genre or to the study of business communication.

1. See Wheatley 90 for a register analysis based on this approach.

2. The London School developed by Firth did put great emphasis on the role of context, building on field work done by Malinowski. Their work was not influential in main stream linguistics at this time however.

CHAPTER 4

ORGANISATIONAL COMMUNICATION

4.1 Background

In his essay `Organizational Communication' (1983), Karl Weick quotes Bernstein describing the field of organisational communication as `a discipline in search of a domain'. Weick suggests that this characterization need not be taken too gravely and that it is to the good of organisational communication to have both unclearly defined spheres of interest and unclearly defined research disciplines. In organisational communication what works is acceptable, in a way that is not the case in either ethnomethodolgy or social psychology. Its ground rules set out by Weick are very much those for this linguistically oriented thesis. If it will provide results, pursue it, otherwise drop it.

Until quite recently organisational communication has had little to do with linguistics. Since the eighties, however, the need for more language centered approaches has been acknowledged and more language based empirical studies to be carried out in organisational settings has been called for. Setting out a research agenda for Organisational Communication Weick lists seventeen approaches, eleven of which have a linguistic element.

> dysfunctions of talk, comparisons that promote understanding of talk, effects of talk on action, alternatives to survey methods, ties between micro and macro level analyses, eloquence as leadership, talk and mindlessness, linguistically bound rationality, the substance

> of context, deviation amplifying feedback and organization specific talk.
> (Weick 83, p.28)

Other claims relating the lack of empirical data for organisational communication can be found across the recent literature.

> We in organizational communication have spent very little time observing and describing the communicative activities of organizational members. Even though our organizational and managerial theorizing goes on unabated, we have generally glossed over or ignored the very stuff that our theories purport to explain: organizational COMMUNICATION.
> (Trujillo 83)

Claims focus on the need to study talk as it occurs in small groups.

> What is somewhat alarming, however, is the fact that the ordinary, routine stuff of everyday communication - naturally occurring talk - is so rarely examined as a topic in its own right. Throughout the history of group research, it is indeed the exception - rather than the rule itself - to train students in the gathering and analysis of their own audio and/or video recordings of actual groups. The overriding goal of working directly with conversational recordings is to describe and explain how groups rely on talk to organise diverse

SETTINGS (e.g business, government, medical, legal, school,home,recreational) in and through the accomplishment of particular activities (e.g. planning sessions, business meetings ... bargaining and negotiation discussions...)
(W.A. Beach 84, p.320)

More specifically on the topic of decision making;

...we still know relatively little about how decisions are actually made on a day to day basis; we lack an understanding of how alternatives appear, are narrowed and how choices are finally made. It is time to explore new and creative approaches to the study of decision making.
Tompkins and Cheney 83, p.123)

More specifically still as a critique of phasic models of decision making;

Because phasic theorists paint with broad strokes, they have not capitalised on the potential of microanalysis. They take a one dimensional view which regards interaction sequences as useful indicators of broader phases of group activity, but ignores their role as an active force in the development of group decisions. This results in a serious problem for phasic research.
WITHOUT REFERENCE TO MICROLEVEL PROCESSES A COMPLETE EXPLANATION OF DECISION MAKING IS IMPOSSIBLE.

(M.S. Poole 85, p.212)

The call for micro analysis, directed at small groups involved in decision making has been about since the mid eighties. There is still little sign of research results in the field. Clearly therefore there is a gap in the domain of organisational communication where there should be research into micro level procedures in small decision making groups. There is a gap due to the information that such research should supply. There is a gap in knowing what techniques will perform such research most effectively.

This thesis aims to redress some aspects of this situation. It aims to discover communicative features of a professional work area, namely document design. Secondly, it aims to discover successful means of doing the analysis that may then be applied to other organisational communication situations.

Reasons for the shortage of discourse based studies of business groups may well be both practical and theoretical. Practically, such data is not easily come by. The private sector in particular is somewhat protective of its skills and unwilling to leave a permanent imprint of them on tape. Secondly it is only recently that major academic disciplines that could contribute to a language oriented approach to small group activity have reached some kind of common ground. Conversation analysts in the eighties have broadened the scope of their research from casual conversation to talk in a range of institutional settings. Social psychology has become disenchanted with its scientific experimental approach and is looking for applications in real life settings using language as a means. Thirdly, in organisational communication there is a call for a research agenda as outlined above that focusses on micro analysis. Discourse analysis has been investigating professional activity since the mid seventies but one feels that its aims have been academic or educational. Apart from the work of Labov and Fanshell (1977) & Lampi (1986) there have been few professional collaborations or work done aimed to interface linguistics with professional activity.

Mirja Liisa Lampi's work (1986) makes use of discourse analysis and pragmatics in her work. She highlights patterns of language based activity that regularly constitute business negotiation. She also illustrates how in bargaining sessions what counts as a preferred response for a seller is not the same as for a buyer, and that the recognition of one's role means that adjacency pairs will be constructed differently by the actors according to their cooperative understanding of what is preferred and dispreferred for the other and for oneself. Lampi's work is outstanding in two ways: firstly as an example of detailed linguistic analysis of a type of organisational communication, a bargaining session. Secondly it is a rarity indeed to find detailed micro analysis, both pragmatic and discourse analytic being used to construct the working context for a business situation. A lot more work covering similar ground is necessary. If there is a weakness to her work it is the paucity of data. She uses just one 40 minute negotiation. This allows one to recognise patterns in one instance of negotiation but not to see differences across negotiation events that may be accounted for by local organisational or professional features. This thesis will build on the work done by Lampi but will operate at a comparative level to get a more generic feel for the essential attributes and the allowable variations in the professional activities that constitute document design.

4.2 Small Groups and Decision Making

This has traditionally been a popular territory for research in both social psychology and organisational communication. Much of the work has centered on developing phasic models to account for group development and the stages groups go through from the start to the finish of their task. Applbaum (1984) has made an overview of the models that have been developed, between which there is a deal of similarity. Applbaum points out some of the assumptions on which all phase theorems are based;

> First, a "natural" process of group decision making exists. That is groups proceed in the decision making process in a fairly consistent pattern. Second decision phases are comprised

> of distinct activities or interactive behaviours. Third structural phases occur within a specified time frame. And if all three of these assumptions are correct, a basic group phase theorem should be generalizable across a variety of group and organizational contexts.
> (Applbaum 84, p.174)

These assumptions show how phase theory runs counter to micro analytical or discourse analytical approaches. It has macro goals; it aims to provide a theory that will account for all group decision making regardless of local contextual features. It seeks to explain a group process in terms of fixed stages with set characteristics. Each stage is viewed statically with no concern for the manner or reasons why a group might move from one phase to the next. It ignores all the small scale features that micro level analysis relies upon to build structures of social interaction out of participant action and speech; context, group history, task. It ignores small scale patterning of social interaction through exchange structure and turn taking; features that reflexively and indexically both reflect and constitute the social structure of particular types of social situation. Instead it focusses on the most general categories available in the hope of saying something about the process of decision making in general, that will be true for all contexts.

The Models

One of the first models was Bales and Strodtbeck's (Bales and Strodtbeck 51). They found three phases, each one dominated by a different pattern of group interaction.

1. Emphasis on problems of orientation
2. Emphasis on problems of evaluation
3. Emphasis on problems of control

(In Applbaum 84, p.175)

These results, like most reached by social psychologists, `were based on observation of laboratory groups dealing with problem solving tasks' (Applbaum 84, p.175). Generalisations based on such data must be suspect. Firstly lab groups tend to have zero history; of being a group or even of personal acquaintance. A group that has worked together before is likely to approach a task differently than a zero history group of students. Secondly the task is not generalizable for all other possible groups. Lab tasks tend to be void or real social content which is likely to affect the way the task is performed. Thirdly the mere fact of putting a group into experimental conditions means it is unlikely to replicate the social process of group behaviour. Such research may explain how students interact in lab conditions but beyond that hypotheses need to be tested with authentic data.

Bales and Strodtbeck say their model is linear; groups move through the same sequence of phases for each decision. For each decision the group has to make it recycles to phase one and repeats the linear process. This model was developed using Bales' own interaction coding system, IPA (Bales 1950). As a way of measuring social interaction it has limitations. No attempt is made to show how behaviour of participants creates interaction. Chunks of behaviour have to be coded either as types of task oriented behaviour or as socially oriented, with no way of coding action that might perform both these functions. As with the model it produces, IPA itself is static and product oriented. Coding is done with no regard for how the participants themselves view what is going on.

Other theories operate on the same theoretical wavelength. Tuckman has a four stage model.

Stage 1. Forming
Stage 2. Storming
Stage 3. Norming
Stage 4. Performing
(In Applbaum 84, p.177)

As with Bales's model, each phase is seen in two ways; as group structure dealing with patterns of interpersonal relations, and as task behaviour dealing with work being done by the group.

Fisher (1974) also developed a four phase theory.

Phase 1. Orientation
Phase 2. Conflict
Phase 3. Emergence
Phase 4. Reinforcement
(In Applbaum 84, p.179)

Even researchers in the field of organisational communication who are sceptical about the research carried out above still remain convinced that a fixed phase theory of some kind. Applbaum concludes

> Despite three decades of descriptive studies in which a number of phase theorems have been proposed in a variety of disciplines, we have barely scratched the surface in attempting to understand how the process of group decision making operates. A major gap in our literature appears in unsatisfactory or inadequate attempts to explain the relationship between decision making and phase structures. We lack a single generalised theory to describe the phasic structures during decision making. All existing models have developed from studies which appear upon close inspection to have some methodological or conceptual flaws. Nevertheless it is quite obvious that phase structures do exist.
> (Applbaum 84, p.183)

It is this overgeneralised phase model approach that micro analytical approaches to organisational communication research need to refine or replace. This research will not look for any kind of phasic model but will seek to establish patterns of small group interaction that are consistent from group to group when the professional task is of a similar nature and which vary when the task changes. In organisational communication terms then this research is moving the research agenda away from the search for one model of group decision making that is valid across contexts to a focus precisely on the contextual variation and what it is that varies in terms of communication when the contextual parameters of the situation alter.

4.3 Context Sensitive Approaches to Small Groups and Decision Making

More interpretivist organisational communication studies have recently become interested in small groups and decision making. Putnam (1983, 1985) has looked at the varying nature of groups within organisations. Her approach is moving toward micro concerns; in search of variation and its causes instead of theories that account for all organisational communication.

Putnam details three causes of differences in groups and group interaction in organisations. These are connectivity, hierarchical structure and multiple group membership. Connectivity is the way groups link together and involves looking at the roles of `gate keepers' and `boundary spanners'. In this latter group one finds, according to Putnam, pr advertising and marketing people. Technical writers too, who engage in meetings with client companies in order to make that company's product accessible to its market are also engaged in a boundary spanning role. PR people can also be boundary spanners within an organisation as the meetings and tasks they are part of often bring people together from otherwise disparate parts of the organisation, as my own data shows. Hierarchical structure is another variable that will influence group activity. Is the group comprised of equals or is there a status differential, does the group task have high priority within the organisation or not. A third cluster of variables centers on the notion of multiple group membership. Individuals are members of more than one group, have divided loyalties and don't necessarily therefore perform to a consensus model. This is a notion of Karl Weick's (1979), that groups form among people with common means and diverse ends, rather than common goals.

Putnam sees that group differences along these lines will lead to different types of group development, that some groups may miss out a phase altogether. Putnam still seems to maintain faith in phasic theory, although it seems to me that if one can find enough variables that cause change in group development that a phasic theory will need to be replaced by a theory of contextual variability. Putnam does not do a micro analysis of groups herself, but does usefully highlight the types of variable that will possibly effect group development. Detailed practical analysis, however, of data such as is to be found in this thesis is needed to see just how in local here and now situations this variability is accomplished or necessitated.

4.4 Structuration Theory and Decision Making

The work of Marshall Scott Poole has used Giddens' structuration theory to explain group decision making interaction from the bottom up as opposed to Fisher, Bales and others' top down approach to the subject. For Poole

> the tasks people engage in area critical determinant of their interaction sequences.
> (Poole 85, p.206)

Structuration theory takes differences in task and social characteristics of the group into consideration when accounting for a group's decision making processes. Poole criticises phasic models.

> Phasic theories do not attempt to explain specific sequences. Instead, they offer explanations of the types of interaction patterns that generally occur during specific periods of discussion.
> (ibid, p.209)

Poole accounts for the strength of linear phasic theory not in terms of accuracy but because, in scientific fashion, it is `parsimonious'. It is a simple explanation for a wide variety of events. Once variation is allowed in the model must complicate and complicate. That is a fact of life for researchers in the humanist tradition. Poole does not withdraw support for phasic models entirely, but he does complicate the picture by suggesting a multiple sequence model. This model allows for contingency variables in both the group's task and its social relationships. Poole advances several hypotheses to account for how these variables might influence the decision making process.

> Proposition 1. The group will engage in those [phases] that correspond to the missing components of the task completion structure
>
> Proposition 1a. The order of [phases] will correspond to the logical priority of the missing task components
>
> Proposition 2a. High task difficulty will result in more problem definition and diagnosis and more recycling through than will low difficulty tasks. It will also result in more orientation and process comments.
>
> (ibid, p.211)

Poole recognises that his theory is still working at a macro level and calls for micro analysis into interaction sequences.

> An adequate theory must account for how a decision is constituted in and through interaction, how the contingency factors are mediated by member reactions and how interaction advances the group towards a decision.
> (ibid, p.212)

4.5 Communicative Events, Structuration and Genre

Organisational communication looks to communication studies in general for ways of learning about group interaction. Shimanoff (84) lists some basic rules of communication that can be used to differentiate types of group interaction;

> (1) who says, (2) what, (3) to whom, (4) when, (5) with what duration, (6) through what medium (7) by what decision procedure.
> (Shimanoff 84, p.51)

Such considerations lead us to apply the concept of `communicative event' as outlined by Hymes (1964 & 1974) to organisational communication. Descriptions of the data analysed in this thesis have all been rudimentarily described using Hymes' (1964) and Saville Troike's (1982) communicative event categories. It provides a useful starting point for recognising basic similarities and differences in types of professional interaction that occur with a different range of professional participants and at different stages of the document design process.

Using structuration theory as a support, this thesis then develops techniques of analysis to show generic qualities in the unfolding of the interaction within these communicative events. Structuration theory provides useful support for a genre analytic approach in a number of ways. It deals with `the ongoing interaction between individuals and institutions' (Yates and Orlikowski 1992). This is the heart of the matter for a study of professionally produced discourse. Structuration theory lends support to a generic view of such communication. Swales himself has embraced it recently (Swales 1992) as an alternative explanation for genre to his original reliance on the notion of discourse community. Whereas faith in the responsibility of discourse communities for the production and maintenance of genre requires faith in a social constructionist view of the world, using structuration theory allows one to sit on the fence between those who would argue that man is a `controlled social agent' and those who would see him as `a reflexively unfettered existential agent' (Macintosh and Scapens 1990).

Structuration theory makes a basic distinction between system and structure. Structure is the rules and resources people use in interaction. System is the observable outcomes of the applications of structures or "regularised relations of interdependence between individuals and groups", (Poole 85, p.213)

Any group's interaction patterns in meetings for example, can be regarded as a social system. The structure consists of rules and resources that are available for getting the job done. Structures have a dual nature, they are both the medium and the outcome of action. They are the medium because structures provide the rules and resources people must draw upon to interact. They are the outcome because rules and resources only exist through being applied and acknowledged in interaction, they have no reality outside of the social practices they constitute.

Structuration allows one then to see individuals as being more than `social dupes' (Garfinkel 1967). People have intentions in social activities and can verbalise what these intentions are. Giddens calls this `discursive consciousness'. On the other hand there are social structures that constrain and control the way in which social activity is performed. Giddens says

> There is a vital sense in which all of us do chronically apply phonological and grammatical laws in speech - as well as all sorts of practical principals of conduct - even though we could not formulate those laws discursively (let alone hold them in mind during discourse). (Giddens 79, p.25)

For genre analysis this means that one can expect regularity in the way social activities are typically done. Structures provide short cuts to those who regularly engage in them. On the other hand, people are not bound by structural rules. There is scope for variation and change. Yates and Orlikowsky (1992) make use of structurational theory in this respect to describe historical changes in the business communication genre of the memo.

Poole et al, then, have been influential in changing traditional decision making research in organisational communication using structuration theory for support. The social psychological experiment based (see Brandstatter et al 1982) methods have given way to context sensitive, task sensitive approaches. Poole and his colleagues do not themselves use genre analysis but they do recognise that `to study structuration we must focus directly on group interaction processes' (Poole & De Sanctis 1990, p.180). Yates and Orlikowski use genre `to explain organisational communication as a structurational process' (Yates & Orlikowski 92, p.300). Swales sees structuration theory as providing fundamental approach to the study of genre, in particular to institutional genres, such as those that this thesis is investigating. Swales refers to a forthcoming article by Michael Stubbs that lists three `shaping theses' for future linguistic research. On of these is

> The concept of `institution' will become increasingly central to linguistics, and following Giddens, so will the concept of genre.
> (Swales 92, p.11)

Organisational Communication then is the natural discipline for the study being carried out in this thesis. Only in the last decade however has there been such a change in the aims and methods of this field of study to make this thesis acceptable to that discourse community. A genre analysis of professional communication then stands at an interesting and new intersection between linguistic research, research into social action,and research into organisational communication. The focus of this thesis is primarily linguistic but this is no longer an isolable sector of academe. As another of Stubbs's shaping theses points out

> Linguistics will take more seriously again the classic problem of how language relates to the world.
> (ibid, p.11)

Linguistics in general and genre analysis in particular must concern itself not just with solving its own internal problems but must increasingly find ways of relating what it says to the everyday world and as available explanation for what goes on there. It is an aim of this thesis to make a contribution on this front.

CHAPTER 5

NEGOTIATION ACTIVITY WITHIN THE GENRE OF DOCUMENT DESIGN PRESENTATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the linguistic enactment of presentations by a small team of professional people involved in producing business documentation. I will show that there is a regular generic pattern to the way this task is carried out. This will then allow me to discuss negotiation as part of the routine way in which presentations are performed. I will show its location, its function and its pattern of onset.

The document in question here is a brochure being produced by Birmingham University, England in order to interest industry in using Birmingham University as a research and consultancy partner. It is a document aimed at a wide audience. It is aimed to stimulate initial interest. For this reason it is light on words, heavy on visuals and heavy on design.[1]
This makes the presentation of this design to interested parties crucial to the progress of the project. Three instances of such presentations provide the data for this study.[2]

The social activity occurring here is document design, and the stage that this process has reached is called a presentation. This is a term used in at least two of the three example texts, which stands as some evidence that the participants are oriented to the stage of the process and furthermore that they are aware of what is and is not usual behaviour in such a stage. The consequences of this are that the rules of the game are not those of a negotiation, if such rules there be, but those of the work event taking place. Different work events allow different types of interaction to occur Some are verbal, some are not. Some are monologic, some are interactive. Some will use text types such as narrative and exposition and will facilitate an information flow from one party to another; a briefing is such an event. Some will be built around question and answer sequences and the use of directives; negotiation speech events, it seems, can be like this (Donohue and Diez 1985). Presentations permit, are designed to allow, the flow of information largely in one direction. Additionally this stage of the document design process calls for an evaluation of what is presented, before further stages of the document design process can be undertaken. It is this feature of the social situation that allows for negotiation to take place. The way in which it occurs are due to the nature of a presentation and the working practices of this group of people.

Definitions of Negotiation

Some definitions of negotiation activity, however, do help locate the genre of this business activity, and highlight what it does and does not achieve.

1. **Verbal communication between two or more parties which is at least ostensibly aimed at reaching joint agreement on some course of**

action or verbal formulation.
(Pruitt 69, p.2)

The expected outcome of these presentation events is all party agreement. Indeed the event exists largely to allow that agreement to be voiced. In the case of document design it is agreement on a course of action; how to design a brochure and less on verbal formulation than visual, which is the jurisdiction of the designer, who is doing the presentation..

2. **Negotiation involves more than a decision to confer: `there must be an operative desire to clarify, ameliorate, adjust or settle the dispute or situation.**
   (Morley and Stephenson 77, p.22)

What is going on in this data is not a dispute that needs settling, but it is a situation and one defined by those participating as a presentation. Clearly more is going on than conferral and as my analysis shows, this is the sharing of information, the clarification of that information and where necessary the agreeing of changes to what is presented. All this is done to move the work towards the goal of producing a document to specification.

Morley and Stephenson present some `defining characteristics' of negotiation (op cit, p.23) which are apposite to this data.

1. **Negotiators must engage in a process of joint decision making.**

This is true for my data, although it is not the main activity taking place. The main action in these meetings is the presentation of design features; in itself this is not decision making, although it does provide substance for decisions to be made upon.

2. Negotiations are mixed motive situations.

This may well be a convenient description of a negotiation event, but as I have already indicated, this data is not being approached by the analyst or by the participants as a negotiation; it is a stage in the process of document design in which some of the verbal activity that occurs fits many of the definitions put forward for negotiating activity. The data doesn't fit the bill however as an example of a negotiation situation.

3. Negotiation involves strategic decision making.

In this data this may be the case. The analysis to follow will show a structured, organised pattern to the decision making that occurs in this meeting. It will be shown to occur in well defined ways and in characterisable sequential positions; whether this counts as strategic I remain unsure. Certainly the participants are not pitting against one another in order to achieve their individual conflicting objectives. There is a shared objective to produce as good a brochure as possible for the client. The relationship of client - designer which is the working condition for this interaction does not allow for the kind of negotiation between two parties over the price or delivery of goods. Rather it allows for team negotiations. All members are working cooperatively towards a shared goal; and each brings different sets of skills and knowledge to bear on the operation. No one party knows how the brochure will look at the outset of the project. The public relations officer (pro) knows the kind of text he might write; the industrial liaison officer knows what must be said to appease university departments and the designer has a repertoire of styles she works with.

5.2 A Contextual Micro Analytical Approach

There have been numerous requests in the management communication data for micro analysis of negotiation and decision making. (Poole, 1985, Putnam, 1985) Until now there is still very little that has been done to focus on the communicative practices of institutional activity.[3] Within business communication research there has been a focus on a specified type of activity but in unspecified situations. Thus there has been a mass of work to uncover phases in small group behaviour (Bales 1950, Fisher 1974, Tuckman 1965), or patterns of decision making (Brandstatter et al, 1982 for a review). What these studies did not do was to focus on the nature of any authentic socially situated task. Social psychologists set up experiments that didn't mirror any real life activity and small group theorists would ignore any specific activity in the search for general features of working in a small group. Poole (85 and passim) recognised the importance of the task dimension. His research showed how phase theories of decision making ignored the task dimension. He hypothesised that task would be the key variable in small group interaction, (Poole 1985).

The recurring type of work situation taking place in these three meetings is the presentation stage, or stages of a document design. It is this task and the work environment that are responsible for the parameters of what can and cannot be done. It is by understanding the communicative activities that constitute this kind of task that understanding of negotiation will be furthered. Negotiation that is, as it occurs outside of Negotiation speech events; in all the many working and family environments where decisions are made and agreements on a course of action are reached.

Various researchers have shown basic patterns of discourse that can embody the activity of deciding or reaching agreement. (Jackson and Jacobs 1981, D. Murray 1987). The nub of decision making is not necessarily problematic, indeed it may be a rather dull exchange. What is needed is to understand the kinds of activity types that negotiation work can be embedded in. It is these larger patterned practices that we use, invent and `restructure' [4] that we need to get to grips with. One such activity, a presentation, comes under scrutiny in the following pages. The analysis that follows supports the claim that within document design a presentation is a recognisable genre in which participants display awareness of the limited means at their disposal for negotiating change to the design features.

5.3 Introduction to the Data

There are three participants involved in this process. They are the university's public affairs officer - referred to as pro hereafter. He is responsible for the university's public relations and is the main brochure copywriter. The Director of Industrial Liaison at the university; it is his job to interest industry in what the university can do and to help set up research projects. He is the client for this brochure, it is being paid for out of his budget. He will be the main user; handing out copies at presentations and arranging a direct mailshot to likely collaborating companies. Thirdly there is the designer. She is not a university employee but works for a private design consultancy company. This company and this designer have a long history of successful collaboration with Birmingham University and particularly with the Public Affairs Department and this pro in particular.

The transcripts analysed here are each framed parts of longer meetings. By this I mean that work is done in each of the meetings to demarcate the presentation from other activity. The way this is done will be discussed later. The sections under consideration are presentations of design work to other members of the team. Tape 5 occurs at a fairly early stage, at least some four months before Tapes 11 and 15. Here the pro presents the designer's rough sketches to the client. Tapes 11 and 15 occur within a week of each other. Tape 11 is a presentation of a mock up brochure by the designer to the pro. Tape 15 is a presentation of the same brochure in the same state by the designer to the client, with the pro also present and participating. No work is done on the brochure between Tape 11 and 15. In fact there is no contact at all between the parties in the intervening time. Tape 11 can be seen as a dry run for the following important meeting where the client must be content with what he sees.

5.4 Introduction to the Analysis

Professional documents such as this are designed by a process that is bound to involve some negotiation. Stages such as briefings, draft checks and presentations seem to be the key interactive elements of the process, interspersed with more individual stages of the process such as designing the spreads, and writing the copy. These interactive stages allow other members of the group to evaluate and seek clarification on what it is that one or other group member has done individually. Briefings allow the designer to reach a common understanding with her client on the job specification being set. Draft reviews allow realignment between client and text producer on wording. Presentations allow the client to evaluate the product of the designer's work, which he had a hand in specifying at the briefing. It is at these points of the interaction, across all three presentations under consideration here, that negotiation occurs. It is negotiation that is always linked to the client's negative evaluation, or failure to understand what he is shown.

The aims of the ensuing analysis are to show :

1. Features of a kind of talk at work, a presentation, that distinguish it from other forms of talk.
2. Common interactional, sequential features that belong generically to this kind of presentation and distinguish it from other interactive stages of the document design process.
3. The points in presentation stages as defined by the analysis that allow for negotiation to occur and the regular forms that negotiation takes.

The paper will examine types of interactional sequence and in particular, the way they are enacted in Tapes 11 and 15. Attention will be paid to the way participants themselves orient to the kind of activity they collaboratively engage in but not exclusively so. The analysis will impose a coding scheme on the data in order to categorise sections of the interaction in a manner that may well be called etic rather than emic.

By this I mean that features of the discourse will be analysed other than those which are necessarily orientated to by the participants. The concept of a presentation is emic; the participants themselves use the term and one can use this orientation to suggest organisational goals that belong to taking part in this sort of talk. The detailed linguistic analysis of the data however is in terms of moves (Sinclair & Coulthard 1975) and topic types F.Davies

(1984, 85, 86). These are analyst terms and constructs, not directly oriented to by participants but useful for showing that what counts as a complete activity, the presentation, which is recognised by the participants, has a regular, patterned, sequential structure throughout its construction.

These Units then are etic, not necessarily verbally accounted for by the participants but essential as the basic building blocks of the activity, for providing a complete analysis of the activity and for locating the generic features of this talk, a design presentation. Because the Units I identify do recur and form a structured sequential pattern for the talk, I think one can then say that this is evidence for the participants themselves constructing a social activity in a recognised and mutually oriented to manner. The means by which this evidence is gathered and analysed, however, do not depend on participant recognition of each act he or she performs in the discourse, hence an etic rather than emic approach.

Analytical Framework

The outer framework of this analysis is in two parts. It consists firstly of a coding scheme that owes something to categories of acts and moves as found in Sinclair & Coulthard (1975), Ventola (1987), and Lampi (1986). No attempt has been made to establish an exchange structure, or to prepare a closed list of items for coding all the moves in the interaction. Nevertheless, as I hope this paper shows, coding of most utterances need not be particularly problematic, if done in broad terms. The point of the analysis, following Hasan (1984) and Ventola (1987) is to recognise a generic sequential pattern in the unfolding social activity in each of the three transcripts.

Topic Type Analysis

The second element is Topic-type Analysis. Above this coding system, the presentation data has been categorised in terms of topic type. David Francis wrote that `there are constraints upon topicality in negotiation talk which are not operative for ordinary conversation' (Francis 86, p.55). Here these constraints are categorised in terms of topic type rather than topic per se.

Traditionally topic has been analysed to show a coherence of content in a stretch of discourse. Researchers have tried to recognise `topically coherent units' (Francis 1986) by recognising points at which new topics are introduced, (Button & Casey 1984, Crow. B (1983), or the way topics drift from one to another (Sacks, 1992). Topic, was initially a candidate analysis for this data; however it did not prove a useful unit for this data. Almost the only topic is the brochure or at a more delicate level each page of the brochure or each item on a page as it is brought to the attention of those receiving the presentation details. There is however a regular way in which these topics are oriented to by the participants, which clearly shows organisation and sequential patterning in the talk. Each topic is presented, evaluated and clarified rather than say questioned or directed, as is commonly the case in classroom discourse. This allows the adaption of the category of topic type for the categorisation of the recurring types of activity that are performed on each topic.

This is a text framework developed by F. Davies (F. Davies 1984, 85 & 86). It works on the principle that while there may be an unlimited number of topics there is a limited number of topic types. This was originally applied to scientific texts but with a change of the topic types seems equally applicable to this presentation data. The fact that there are so few of these types in the data makes the analysis particularly suitable.

By focussing on topic type I am attempting to define a different unit of talk to topic; one that shares some of the attributes of Levinson's activity types (Levinson 1979); in fact a hybrid of this and topic. I think what Levinson calls an activity type would equate with a whole presentation from my data and I wish to carry out the analysis on a smaller unit of discourse. The unit I have in mind bears some relation to what Ervin Tripp (in Dumesnil, J. and Dorval, B. (1989) calls `talk episodes'. This is a unit below speech event on a rank scale. Thus a speech event is composed of a number of talk episodes. While this holds true for the unit I call a topic type, I think the way `talk episode' is conceived of is as a recognisable part of the whole social activity, such as the discussion of grades in a school counselling session (Ervin Tripp, ibid), whereas topic type is a category of discourse unit, rather than a social action per se, which, in the structured company of other such units constitutes the social activity in question; here of doing a presentation. It has something in common with what Sinclair and Coulthard (1975) call a `transaction' and what Lampi (1986) calls a `phase'. Lampi equates phase with Sinclair and Coulthard's transaction (86 p. 51). However she uses it to distinguish bargaining sections from discussion sections in her data. Her bargaining phases are self contained units of activity, not the case for my topic types, which are only constituent parts of such a unit. Sinclair and Coulthard's own description of transactions for classroom activity does seem more in keeping with the units I am describing, (Sinclair & Coulthard 75, p.56-57). However as their definition of a transaction is in terms of a number of exchanges and this analysis recognises no unit in between move and what I am calling topic type I think to call them transactions would be misleading. I do however see this work as an attempt to make meaningful structural analysis at a level above the exchange, at a level where Sinclair and Coulthard left off, which should be a suitable site for genre analysis.

5.5 The Analysis

The Topic Types

All three interaction sequences contain no more than five distinct topic types. This, I argue is a distinguishing feature of this kind of discourse; separating it, I suspect, from everyday conversation where such a narrow range of topic types would not be expected, and clearly separating presentation interaction from other stages of the document design process, such as briefings, where a different set of topic types occur.

The topic types in question are as follows.

VISUAL PRESENTATION
NEGATIVE EVALUATION
POSITIVE EVALUATION
CLARIFICATION
PROCEDURAL.

Very nearly all the data fits happily into these five categories. This topic type listing does not tell us what the participants were talking about at any particular stage, but it does inform us as to what they were doing. Whatever topic arose in the course of the presentation, arose to achieve one of the above five types of interaction.

Here is a breakdown of the levels of occurrence of these topic types in the three tape sections under consideration.

Table 5.1. Topic Type Breakdown for Presentations Data

	Tape 5	Tape 11	Tape 15
Visual Presentation	9	16	14

Negative Evaluation	4	-	5
Positive Evaluation	3	3	2
Clarification	8	1	9
Procedural	3	4	5
Others	7	-	1
Totals	34	24	36

Here are some short yet typical examples of the five topic types. For clarity, only the key moves have been labelled, (See Appendix 1 for a complete analysis). A glossary for the move types can be found in Chapter 2. Following the examples, a description of the key constituent elements will be given of the most common topic type, the visual presentation.

Visual Presentation

Designer	PSHIFT	the cover
	VPRES	is a generic cover but erm obviously we're falling in line with the bio technology
Client	ACK	yes yes
Designer	POS EV	so it all follows through
	VPRES	erm obviously heading across the centre. The whole cover, the way that it would be printed is erm working on textures, a matt cover ...

	POS EV	we're very simple sophisticated
Client	ACK	yes

(Tape 15, Unit 4)

This, not surprisingly, is the most common topic type. It is always the presenter who initiates these topics, the designer on Tapes 11 and 15, the pro on Tape 5.

Negative Evaluation

Client	NEG EV	I was just wondering if you think that 'among them are researchers and scholars of high distinction' is a bit is a bit mealy mouthed
	DP	whether we should [simply make a statement
Pro		what does it say?] there are can I see that a sec
Cl		We should just make a statement of er you know our staff are researchers and scholars of high distinction
Pro		we're not the kind of
Cl		I mean I know that's giving you
Pro		yeah
Cl	NEG EV	but it's just 'among them are'

[cont]
(Tape 15, Unit 19)

These negative evaluation topics only occur in client meetings, not in Tape 11 where the presentation is made by the designer to the pro. Furthermore it is always the client who initiates them. Their function in the discourse highlights differences in client and pro roles as presentation receiver. It is through the initiation of negative evaluation sequences that the client can bring about decision making in the presentation. The sequence opening shown above, instigated by the client leads into decision making, a negotiated activity. Without the initiation of this topic type, the presentation would continue and the client's best chance for making a negative evaluation of this item would have passed. If negative evaluation isn't offered in this meeting, indeed at this point in the meeting, it becomes increasingly more difficult for the client to engineer another space for himself to express his lack of approval. Silence here counts as positive evaluation. Indeed the negative evaluation move is immediately followed by a decision proposal. This is now an issue that has to be negotiated to a satisfactory conclusion before the designer can return to her presentation. The sequence ends in the following way.

F	DP	I think I'd suggest we just put there are
J	ack	mmm
B	acc	[yes
F	cont	there] are researchers and scholars of high distinction
	result	then that leads across here they are
	confR	[is this where they are?
J	conf	yeah yeah]
B	pos ev	yes yes that's good that [is good
F	ack	yeah]

(Tape 15, Unit 19)

The pro picks up on the client's proposals and makes a more specific suggestion on the wording. He supports his own proposal and this then receives positive evaluation from the client which means the negotiation can end; the team are in agreement again and talk can revert to enacting the presentation. The client has made a negative evaluation of what the designer has presented and followed this up with his own proposal. This typical negotiation activity within a presentation had to end with either the client's own proposal being accepted by the others or as in this case, the client accepting another modified proposal.

Positive Evaluation

Client	POS EV	I mean this couldn't be more timely now you know I mean
Pro		[no with the research thing
Client		=with the news last night] [about
Pro		oh last night]
Cl	CONT	=about the universities
	ELAB	did you they interviewed some polytechnic director
Pro	ACK	mmm
Client		=who said he thought the big shock was going to be for those universities that dropped of the end.
Pro	ACK	mmm
Client		He said the polys were well used to this world of having to fight for every penny
Pro	ACK	mmm
Client		but some universities who weren't going to make it
.....		
Client	POS EV	and erm so this couldn't be more [timely I think
Pro	AGREE	yeah]

(Tape 15, Unit 11)

Positive evaluation is, to the presenter, a welcome element within the visual presentation sequence and not a disruptive one. Whereas negative evaluation, as explained above cannot be left undealt with by the other participants, positive evaluation can. The presenter here provides no verbal response to what the client says and the Pro offers acknowledgement and agreement. The client's voiced positive evaluation is welcomed by the other two participants but as a discourse unit it has no consequences. Once it can be closed down, the designer can return to her presentation. Occasionally, positive evaluation is judged to form a topic type of its own and then is always initiated by a participant other than the presenter. Evaluation and clarification can either be topic types in their own right or handled within another topic type, normally the visual presentation. It depends how the participants themselves orient to the handling of the issue. If the clarification request can be dealt with promptly and allows swift return to visual presentation, then no purpose is served in the analyst labelling it a separate topic. If however a visual presentation has to be lengthily interrupted in order to deal with say a positive evaluation sequence, as is the case with the example above, then it seems reasonable to label it separately. Thus the labels positive evaluation, negative evaluation and clarify are both names of topic types, and names of moves that occur as parts of the enactment of a topic. Visual presentation too is both a topic type itself and a move within a visual presentation topic.

Clarification

B	frame	Now
	clfyR	what's the small print?
J	cont	you said you weren't going to use the atom bomb
B	ack	yes quite
	clfyR	What's the small print?
J	clfy	The small print is the Cobuild erm dictionary
	elab	I mean these are things [that have been used
B	newsM	ahh so it's a visual]
F	clfy	just a few of the twenty million words [laugh]
B	ack	some of them yeah [laugh]
J	Ssupp	We felt obviously you know it's important really in a publication that it's not all words and that you know you need to supplement [with some diagrams
B	confR	what words can be visual as well]
J	conf	yeah and

(Tape 15, Unit 33)

A clarification request interrupts the ongoing sequence of events; it is an element of the discourse with consequences, it has to be dealt with. Once the clarification request has been successfully dealt with, then events can revert to where they left off, to the default activity of visual presentation. Here the client is simply seeking clarification of an item - the small print on the designer's page. There are other clarification sequences however that do not fall into this simple type, and they function as pre sequences that establish that, for the client at least, there is a problem with the presentation and thus operate as a starting point from where negotiation sequences can develop. Like negative evaluation, seeking clarification is a procedure open to the client for introducing more interactive talk than is the case with visual presentation or positive evaluation topics. It is a legitimate way for the client to interrupt the presentation process and to negotiate some change in current thinking on the brochure, ahead even of the current presentation. The format of a presentation, its turn taking mechanisms, the way it unfolds all indicate the 'work in hand' nature of the issues raised by the client that need resolution not only in this meeting but at this point in the presentation.

Finally there are PROCEDURAL TOPICS.

Pro	FRAME	so erm I've had I've had this prior knowledge of what of what Juliana's done so best if
Des	DP	would you like me to present it
Pro	acc	=you pre you present to Bob
Des		=yeah sure
Pro		yeah
Des		=sure very happy to. Right erm quite a challenge
Pro		[laugh]
Des		a fair challenge . .

(Tape 15, Unit 2)

In all three recordings the presentation is framed by procedural topics. This seems to be an essential part of the presentation process. They function as opening boundary markers Sinclair and Coulthard 75). Here is another example from Tape 11

Pro	FRAME	right
	DIR	Do you want to you lead off [Juliana cos
Des		well yes]
Pro		=you know where we are
Des	ACC	yeah sure.

(Tape 11, Unit 2)

Tapes 11 and 15 also mark the presentation sequence end with very similar procedural topics. On Tape 15 we find;

Des	OFFER	Did you want to go back through it?
Cl	ACC	yes through it again
Pro		well we perhaps ought to rehearse what we said as well
Des		yeah actually I'll just try and
Pro		Have you got your notes Juliana that I seem to remember insisting that you made some

(Tape 15, Unit 37)

And on Tape 11

Pro	REQ	Can we go through it again
Des	ACC	yeah
Pro		and I can make some more detailed
Des		mm
Pro	POS EV	I mean overall I think it's smashing
Des	ACK	oh good
Pro	POS EV	I'm really very excited by it
Des	ACK	hmm good oh good [thankyou
Pro	POS EV	it's great]

(Tape 11, Unit 24)

In both presentations a request or offer of a re run clearly marks the end of the presentation stage. The visual presentation topic is almost entirely lacking from the second run through. It is a strange enough event to have something visually present pointed out once without this being required a second time. These procedural framing topics then demarcate a section of talk wherein topic choice is restricted and a pattern of turn taking exists that is different to both other communicative events and other stages of the document design process. Clearly, reruns create a second slot for negotiation on the same issues, this time without the weight of new information obstructing the client's responses.

Taking care of staging and other procedural matters is a task handled almost single handedly by the pro throughout the whole design process. Not surprisingly then, all the procedural topics in both presentations are initiated by him.

Sequencing Patterns Within the Topic Types

Before looking for pattern in the sequential ordering of the social interaction constituted by these topic types, this section will address the regularity and orderliness of topic enactment itself. In order to justify the initial placing of such an analytical framework over the data this section will show that there is a common development to visual presentation topics that clearly groups them and separates them from say negative evaluation topics. There should also be enough variation in this pattern between the Tapes to highlight differences in the interaction sequences due to varying participant roles.

Hasan (1984) has done work on the genres of both service encounters and nursery tales in terms of optional and obligatory elements occurring with sequential restriction. She has suggested that `the crucial properties of a genre can be expressed as a definite range of possible textual structures' (Hasan 84). It seems possible to see some such pattern for visual presentation topics in both Tapes 11 and 15, and to a lesser extent, due to its weaker genre membership, in Tape 5 also. There are a number of reasons for seeing Tape 5 as less of a presentation than 11 or 15. Firstly, it is not performed by the producer of the work being presented. Secondly, it occurs at an early stage of project development. This means that what is being presented is nowhere near final copy but is only a set of alternatives for the client to assent or dissent to. This means that whereas negative evaluation needs to be resolved in Tapes 11 and 15, and, typically in presentations, this is the site of negotiation activity, this is less the case in Tape 5, where a choice between kinds of approach is looked for rather than a final assessment. The client's negative evaluation of a possible design merely leads to its rejection in favour of other available alternatives. In Tapes 11 and 15, however, there is no other alternative and changes to the design need to be resolved between the participants. The analysis below will focus on Tapes 11 and 15 therefore.

Ventola's work (1987) on service encounter genres, following on from Hasan's, has questioned whether in fact there are any obligatory elements - after all in some instances it is possible to shop without saying anything and without this seeming marked. I suspect that a silent visual presentation in a professional setting, though possible would be highly marked and at some stage commented on. I will try to maintain an obligatory / optional distinction between elements with the proviso that obligatory in this context means slightly less than a 100 per cent occurrence rate and that the absence of such an element would appear marked and need to be accounted for.

Visual Presentation Topics

Obligatory Elements

Both presentations are heavy on visual presentation topics. They account for 66% of all topics in Tape 11 and 40% in Tape 15, where the presence of the client occasions negative evaluation topics and far more clarificatory work. In both presentations nearly all the topics open with a 'page shift' move. Exponents of this in Tape 15 include:

> the cover
> then go onto the informative part
> this one of course
> we then go onto another spread
> and then we have
> we then go onto
> next spread
> and then we go onto the last spread

The first job the presenter does, in both these meetings, the designer, is to direct the attention of her addressee to the appropriate page or part of the page. The visual presentation topics that lack this page shift mechanism are either topic returns after an evaluation or clarification topic or else presentations of design features in general such as 'what we have done is to produce the visual in book form' or 'all of the spreads are designed differently'.

Every other visual presentation topic opens with a page shift marker. The same is true of Tape 11. Here the range of exponents is:

> when we open
> we then go onto
> this is one of the spreads
> and then we go onto
> this here
> and then we get another page
> and then obviously
> and then we get onto our back page
> and then obviously on the back

Again, page shift markers are only absent for exactly the same reasons as in Tape 15.

So far then the opening and obligatory element of a visual presentation topic has been recognised and described. This is followed again in both Tapes, without exception by the visual presentation element itself. As explained earlier the topic visual presentation includes within it a visual presentation move. These are of two basic types.

A) A simple listing of visually present features. Such as, on Tape 15:

The cover is a generic cover,
the heading across the centre,
working on textures, a mat cover generally overall with a corner of it in high gloss,
not giving them any visual on the front cover at all,
the introduction, the large picture of the campus
the main message is obviously that there,

B) An indication of what has been done by the design team, as in the following examples also from Tape 15:

We've looked in typographic terms we've looked at different ways of actually putting all the copy together,
Typographically again , two messages in one,
We've tried obviously to echo the feeling of the cover,

The pattern is repeated in Tape 11. There are simple visual presentations.

saw the front cover as being very plain
that message coming across very strongly
keeping the corporate blue
in terms of overall finish this would obviously be a matt varnish,

again using just a spot gloss varnish . . .this
follows through on the bio tech,

And ways of showing what has been done.

we've tried to add an element to it that runs
throughout and it's this headline that we have
on all of the pages
I think what we have tried to do is produce a
brochure that has an element of surprise to it
we've tried to treat all these elements ... and
we've tried therefore to make it very different

Both presentations therefore contain the same two opening obligatory elements.

PAGE SHIFT -- VISUAL PRESENTATION

The third element is that of POSITIVE EVALUATION. This occurs in 11 out of 14 visual presentation topics in Tape 15 and 13 out of 15 in Tape 11. In visual presentation topics it is overwhelmingly given by the designer herself; in 9 out of 11 instances in Tape 15 and 12 out of 13 in Tape 11, although here the pro often also provides positive evaluation within the visual presentation topic. In everyday talk positive evaluation of one's own work would be regarded as strange; its regular occurrence here with no uptake indicates its ordinariness and suggests one more distinguishing characteristic of this genre of talk. Positive evaluation by the presenter is an integral part of a design presentation as the data shows. Positive evaluation allows for the smooth ongoing of the presentation process, whereas negative evaluation never occurs within a presentation sequence. When it does occur it is never from the presenter and it develops into a topic in its own right and occasioning a different range of acts to occur. Designer's own positive evaluation can occur in two ways in the presentation sequence; either inextricably linked to the visual presentation itself or as a free standing act. Here are examples of both kinds from Tape 15.

A) As a separate act.

it all follows through.
we're very simple sophisticated
we want to entice them to go inside.
so that there is a liveliness to the brochure.
the way that this works we think is quite nice.
again creating, erm using our white space to effect.

B) Inextricable from the visual presentation act.

Then go on to the informative part of the brochure so to speak . . . the whole of the brochure, the principle of the brochure and the layout works on erm the juxtaposition of type, of sizes of type, . . .of areas of type together.

we tried to obviously echo the feeling of the cover .. of the cover as the centre spread

In the first example juxtaposition of type is positively evaluated as being present in the design and as a feature that makes the brochure work. In the latter, that the centre spread echoes or in some way links up with the front cover is a design positive feature. Clearer examples of type B occur on Tape 11. There are similar free standing positive evaluation acts there too.

A) As a separate act

> but this one we felt very clean in terms of layout
> Little elements like this ---- just to add that little bit more interest

B) The inextricable examples

> that message coming across very strongly, erm keeping the corporate blue that we have that works quite well
> when we open very strong statement about the university
> This is a very very strong statement, the main statement on that page we felt.

Designer positive evaluation can be called a near obligatory act. In Tape 15, only as the presentation draws to an end is the positive evaluation provided by the client. Preceding that, every topic has a positive evaluation element provided by the designer unless, as in topic 15, it is a return to a previously discussed and positively evaluated spread, or because the topic meets serious interruption, in the form of important clarification initiated topics from the client. Thus it seems there is a tendency for the designer to produce positive evaluation of everything she shows of her near final work. It is interruptable however in a way that the visual presentation element is not. The interrupting clarification topics must themselves however be resolved and group alignment regained before the visual presentation can continue. Furthermore, it must be remembered that all the clarification topics effect and depend on the present presentation spread. It could be said then that either positive evaluation is an obligatory part of each presentation element, or else the removal of a client problem with the topic must be achieved. There is no other outcome in either Tape 11 or 15.

Optional Moves

QUALIFICATION

One optional designer move in the presentation sequence is qualification. This might be seen as the designer countering the need for negotiation even before it is initiated. Here are some examples. First from Tape 15;

> Nothing is in a final stage at the moment
> but it will give you an impression of what the

publication should look like.

> but where we come to the listing, again at the end of the day, we may slightly you know do this very slightly differently
> but the overall idea is to get this fanning out of the different faculties.

And from Tape 11;

> Well there are elements in this that we feel obviously we will possibly go through change modify
> but it might give you a feel, ... what the brochure is going to look like
>
> at the end of the day we might actually space these out rather differently once we spend more time on that

The function of this move in a presentation sequence is to stress the non finality of the mock up, or to emphasize possible or likely changes still to be made. By allowing the possibility of change, these moves function to head off some negative evaluation of the mock up and to replace it with positive suggestions. This move indicates the presenter's awareness that what she presents is to be evaluated, and that if this evaluation is negative that change to the design will have to be decided on. The qualification move changes the status of the information being presented from generally negotiable to negotiable on grounds other than those covered in the qualification. These moves also emphasize the designer's orientation to the staging of the process; to what kind of evaluation or criticism is justifiable at a particular stage. This is unequally distributed knowledge at least in this document design process and can be used by some participants to control acceptable and unacceptable discourse contributions.

So far we have a genre enactment that reads;

p shift* -- vis pres* -- pos ev (*) -- qualify
[where * = obligatory]

Addressee Moves in Presentation Topics

All these elements are designer performed. The visual presentation topic is largely presenter dependent and may be carried out with no verbal assistance from the addressee - as some presentation units from Tape 5 indicate. In Tapes 11 and 15, the role of client and pro within the visual presentation topic, is to seek clarification, to offer acknowledgment of what is presented and/or to positively evaluate it. Negative evaluation leads to a new topic type. Sometimes positive evaluation and clarification requests also lead to new topic talk.

The range of exponents that function as acknowledgment markers is very limited, especially considering that they occur in every visual presentation topic in Tape 15 and Tape 11. The list is no longer than YES, RIGHT, NO, THAT'S RIGHT, MMM, YEAH. They occur widely within and around all the other moves made by the designer. After the visual presentation element, or within it, after or during evaluation, and after or during qualification. One other available move for the addressee is to 'other complete'. This too shows alignment (Nofsinger 1990) with what the presenter presents, that what is being shown is comprehensible and acceptable.

In accounting for this the most frequent topic type in both Tapes we have also accounted for the action that moves the whole process of a visual presentation towards closure. Nearly all the other topics are linked to the ongoing or just completed page presentation. An adjoining clarification topic only concerns items of current interest, as do negative evaluation topics. This will be shown more clearly in the following section.

Only visual presentation topics then, in a visual presentation sequence advance the discourse by introducing new topics for consideration. Other topic types such as clarification requests and negative evaluation are used to initiate negotiation on a range of issues that are relevant to the current topic.

The Sequential Pattern of Topic Type Occurrence in Visual Presentation Sequences

Having outlined the components of the visual presentation sequence and of the visual presentation topic in particular, I now wish to illustrate how these topic types co-occur and thereby to highlight some important features of a presentation sequence. In this section I want to concentrate on how these units co-occur, move from one to the other and back again with some focus on the orientation of the participants themselves to enact a presentation sequence in a particular way.

Once the visual presentation is underway, marked by the procedural topic as outlined in the previous section, then all talk by the participants orients to the ongoingness of the presentation, until it reaches a conclusion, again as marked by a procedural topic as described previously. One can say that although the presenter has no special right to an extended turn he/she does have the right to complete the presentation and that, failing an immediate need to perform other functions relevant to the presentation, the speaking turn will revert to the presenter. There are severe constraints on what the presenter can do with these extended speaking rights in that all topics initiated by her are presentation topics. So this appears to be a feature that distinguishes this kind of professional talk from conversation, where there is no one participant to whom speaking rights revert.

Within the document design process this is certainly one of very few sequence types where the speaker who as a matter of course regains the speaking turn is not the pro, the procedural organizer of the interaction.

This is how topic development for the two presentation sequences looks.

TOPIC LINKAGE for Tape 15

			1. PROCEDURAL
			2. PROCEDURAL
3. PRESENTATION			
4. PRESENTATION			
5. PRESENTATION			
6. PRESENTATION	---	7. CLARIFY	
8. PRESENTATION			
9. PRESENTATION	---	10. CLARIFY	
		11. POSITIVE EVALUATION	
		12. NEGATIVE EVALUATION	
		13. PROCEDURAL	
		14. REFORMULATE	
15. PRESENTATION RETURN (9)			
16. PRESENTATION	---	17. CLARIFY	
18. PRESENTATION	---	19. NEGATIVE EVALUATION	
20. PRESENTATION	---	21. CLARIFY --22. CLARIFY	
		23. PROCEDURAL	
		24. CLARIFY	
		25. BONDING	
		26. POSITIVE EVALUATE	
		27. NEGATIVE EVALUATE	
28. PRESENTATION	--	29. CLARIFY-- 30.NEGATIVE EVALUATE	
31. PRESENTATION	---	32. CLARIFY --33. CLARIFY	
34. PRESENTATION			
35. PRESENTATION			

36. POSITIVE EVALUATION
37. PROCEDURAL

TOPIC LINKAGE for Tape 11

1. PROCEDURAL
2. PROCEDURAL

3. PROCEDURAL
4. PRESENTATION
5. PRESENTATION --- 6. CLARIFY
7. PRESENTATION
8. PRESENTATION
9. PRESENTATION
10. PRESENTATION
11. PRESENTATION
12. PRESENTATION --- 13. POSITIVE EVALUATION
14. PRESENTATION
15. PRESENTATION
16. PRESENTATION --- 17. POSITIVE EVALUATION
18. PRESENTATION
19. PRESENTATION
20. PRESENTATION
21. PRESENTATION

22. POSITIVE EVALUATION
23. PROCEDURAL

Presentation topics are listed down the left margin. Non presentational topics linked to the current presentation issue are placed adjacent to the relevant presentation topic. Most other topics do orient to the current visual presentation. Once any issues of concern, disagreement, dissatisfaction have been negotiated, and in Tapes 11 and 15 they must be dealt with to an adequate conclusion for all parties, then talk will revert to visual presentation.

In Tape 11, once the procedural matters have been dealt with topic progression is as follows.

Topics 1-3 are procedural and once the visual presentation boundary has been established then Topic 4 covers presentation of the brochure in general terms. The topic ends with pro acknowledge moves ('yeah' . . . 'yeah'). This I take to indicate satisfaction with what has been presented so far or at least preparation to hear more and let the presentation complete before making detailed comments. Topic 5 is the cover visual presentation. Pro initiates a clarifying topic on the colour being used, and once this is settled and alignment between pro and designer reestablished then Topic 7 is a return to cover presentation by the designer. This pattern continues throughout the presentation but not beyond its procedural boundaries.

Tape 15 progresses with more hold ups and more expansion at a number of points but the orientation of participants to progress from spread to spread as any problems with the current page are dealt with remains.

One finds a similar orientation to allowing the designer to continue the presentation of her work unless there is a pressing need to do otherwise; to negotiate some change. The presence of the client, looking at near complete final work however does change the range of issues likely to interrupt the designer's progress. Still, all interruptions can be dealt with in terms of the five topic types listed earlier, but of those five there was no negative evaluation topic in Tape 11 whereas there are four occurrences in Tape 15. Additionally in Tape 15 some clarification topics also led to negotiation activity. Consequently, realignment between participants to a discourse consisting largely of presentation topics initiated by only one speaker, is not so easily achieved in Tape 15 as it was in Tape 11. Here is the sequence of topic development

Topics 1 and 2 are procedural, the second setting up the opening frame of the presentation. Topic 3 is the opening general presentation of design team work. It ends with a client accept move ('right right right') and is followed by Topic 4. This opens with a page shift move to direct attention to the cover. The designer's own positive evaluation of it ('we're very simple sophisticated. This is acknowledged by the client and then topic five directs attention to the first spread. Designer positive evaluation of the first half of the spread ('very clean layout') receives no response at all from the client which also seems tantamount therefore to acceptance at least for now and understanding of the work laid before him. This is borne out by the designer's smooth topic progression to the other half of the spread. Topic 6 ends with a client request for clarification. Once alignment

presentation topic in topic 8.
This pattern continues to the end of the presentation. There are larger gaps in the delivery of presentation topics here than in Tape 11. This is largely due to the negative evaluation that client gives that needs to be dealt with and removed there and then - As the work nears completion there is no room left for any party, especially the client to be dissatisfied with what is being done. Earlier Tapes show much more readiness to accommodate higher levels of uncertainty.

5.6 CONCLUSION

It is a distinguishing characteristic of these presentation activities that the talk is oriented around five recurring topic types. This is unlikely to be a feature of other types of discourse. These topic types do not occur in an unstructured way either. There is a pattern to the way they unfold that can be seen as constitutive of doing a presentation as part of the document design process. Visual presentation functions as a default topic. Once any problems have been dealt with it is this topic that will occur; and it is the presenter who will initiate it and be allowed a lengthy turn for this purpose, but for no other purpose. Thus there is a distinct turn taking mechanism for enacting this kind of data that, because it is linked to the occurrence of certain topic types is another defining feature of this kind of presentation.

In presentation talk, negotiation occurs at well

In presentation talk, negotiation occurs at well defined points in the discourse. Issues for negotiation are raised through clarification and negative evaluation topics. Only the client initiates negative evaluation and this can be seen as one indicator of his role as negotiation instigator within these proceedings. The client raises issues for negotiation through negative evaluation and clarificatory moves.

The way the negotiation proceeds is dependent on the stage at which the presentation occurs. In Tape 5 matters can be left unresolved, for further discussion; by Tape 15 realignment of participants, on nearly all the issues is striven for and largely achieved as they occur. Then, once dealt with, the talk reverts to a non - negotiative visual presentation sequence. This pattern holds until all the spreads have been shown.

The sequencing of topic types and of the moves within them across all three presentation episodes demonstrates a generic quality to the enactment of this task. The differences between Tapes 11 and 15 highlight, in structural terms, that it is largely the presence of the client that leads to negotiation activity and that it is through his production of negative evaluation and clarification sequences that this negotiative work is initiated.

1. The initial briefing on this document, Tape 4, to be dealt with in the next chapter, carries this information.

2. See the Communicative Event details for the presentation recordings, in the User guide to

this thesis.

3. There are exceptions. Sinclair & Coulthard 75, Atkinson & Drew 79, Firth 91 among them.

4. Charlotte Linde. Personal Communication.

CHAPTER 6

BRIEFING ACTIVITY IN DOCUMENT DESIGN MEETINGS

6.1 Introduction

This chapter will build on the analysis of presentations developed in the previous section. There the three presentations were all examples of the same or a similar social activity. Members in all three meetings used the term `presentation' to describe what they were doing. The unfolding of the social activity showed a similar range of topic types occurring with similar frequency, in similar order. The main topic types themselves also showed a similar means of development. The data to be analysed now are two briefing sessions that occur back to back in the same meeting. Although participants in each case orient to the term `briefing' to describe what is going on, the topic type development and the sequential organisation within topic types shows differences between the two meetings. The social activity is the same but its linguistic enactment is different. This will lead to an examination of notions of genre as social activity and genre as discourse type, as raised by C.Miller (1984). It also leads to a questioning of linguistic approaches to genre that have described and defined genre membership narrowly in terms of shared linguistic properties, (Hasan, Martin, Ventola). It will also require a consideration of the concept of text type (De Beaugrande 1980, Davies 1985, Van Dijk 1985). To what extent is this concept transferable from written to spoken language activity, and what overlap is there between genre and text type.

Procedure

The analysis will continue in the next chapter by comparing one of the briefings with a draft check meeting. Here we have two different, if related work activities going on in which decision making is a prominent feature. Decision making is a regularly occurring text type for these meetings. It occurs across all the data. It is available as a means of enactment, as a textualisation method for all the social activities, viewed here as genres, that constitute the professional document design process.

Uptil now analysis has been done on texts of the same social activity and the same text type, the presentations. Now, texts of the same social activity (Briefings) but with different textual form will be analysed. One makes regular use of decision making, the other hardly any. In the following chapter the third available option for combining text type and genre will be discussed; texts that enact different social activities but which use a common text type, decision making.

This study will demonstrate, in discourse analytic terms, what it is that occurs in the document design process; who does what, to or with whom, to achieve what outcome. It will also reveal commonly occurring sequential patterns of activity at different stages of the process and describe the range of variation within these activities that still allows them to be considered members of the same genre and to achieve the same required goal. The analysis of spoken interaction developed here provides both sufficient micro analytical detail, and also something generalizable enough to highlight fundamental similarities and differences across different professional genres and between different exemplars of the same activity. A reliable, common sense, discourse coding scheme coupled with topic type analysis and a consideration of text type are the analytic tools to be used here to recognise genre characteristics and to draw some conclusions on the relation between social action and discourse patterning that will be useful in the description and understanding of professional interactive practices.

The Briefings

Background

Both briefings occur within one meeting. These meetings are the earliest I have access to in the design process that led to the presentations of Bob's document in chapter 4. Derek's document, the subject of Briefing 1, is mentioned in those presentations. It is viewed as a relation to Bob's document. Indeed a fair deal of the briefing on Bob's brochure concerns the nature of this relationship with Derek's folder. Bob's document is meant to encourage industrial collaboration over a wide range of the University's activities. Derek's is a more specialised document dealing only with biotechnology.

Discourse Structure

What we see in the briefings are ways of informing the designer of the Birmingham team's concept of the brochures so that she will be able to go away and, either alone or with her own team of designers, produce example page and cover designs for the brochure, which will then, as in tape 5, be brought back to the client and pro for evaluation. From an analysis of Briefing 1, a basic requirement for achieving a briefing, in discourse analytic terms, appears to be an INFORM followed by a RECEIPT MARKER[7]. The former can be produced by any member of the Birmingham team, client or pro. Indeed there is an occasion in Briefing 2 where Bob is raising issues pertinent to Derek's folder. Either Frank, Bob, or Derek can produce the inform element. Only Juliana, for a briefing to be taking place, can produce the receipt marker. What the analysis of both these briefings shows is that this basic requirement is not always fulfilled and that even when it is, by itself it will usually be insufficient. It is the elements around this core discourse exchange that are context shaped and context shaping. It is through an examination of the co-text of the briefing exchange that the sequential regularity of this stage of the document design process can be described and the social event understood.

Topic Type

As with the analysis of presentations we will work outwards from recognising topic types; downward to the different ways they are enacted and upwards towards a generic view of a briefing in sequential terms.

Topic type analysis has not previously been applied to spoken interaction. The term is to be found in F. Davies (1985 & 1986). She used it as a means of analysing the content of written texts with the aim of improving reading skills for non-native students of science[3]. The principle is that topic choice was virtually unlimited but that topic types were finite in number and could be demarcated by linguistic analysis. The case is true in document design. The issues that need to be discussed are innumerable and dependent on local contingencies. There is no reason to think that any two document design briefings will contain any two identical topics, save that they will concern the document itself in some way. Nevertheless, as shown for presentations, there is a restriction on the kind of topic that occurs in a briefing. The features that constitute a briefing therefore, other than that it must in someway deal with the document in question are not so much what is discussed but the type of interaction that takes place.

Text Type

Topic type has connections with what De Beaugrande and Dressler call text types. They describe these as

> classes of texts with typical patterns of characteristics.
> (De Beaugrande & Dressler 81, p.181)

and as

> classes of texts expected to have certain traits for certain purposes
> (ibid, p.182)

They make the useful link between text type and intertextuality.

> The ways in which the production and reception of a given text depends upon the participants' knowledge of other texts.
> (ibid, p.182)

Use of the terms `production' and `reception' shows a focus on written texts. It seems to me however that spoken language is also likely to result in the production of text types and that this is going to intersect with notions of both genre and intertextuality. I shall use genre to refer to regularly occurring types of social activity, whether these have common linguistic features or not. Text type will be reserved for texts that share linguistic features, whether or not they are enacting the same social activity. For document design then it is presentations, briefings and draft reviews that are at least candidates to be genres as these are social activities. Decision making, on the other hand, regularly occurring across these genres and with a regular pattern of enactment that will be detailed in the next chapter, is seen as a text type. The Davies notion of topic type sits between the two but is used here to help identify constituent semantic features of the social activities within document design.

Expert and Novice Participants

What we find in the Briefings are a mixture of expert and novice practitioners. Both Frank and Juliana have clearly been involved in briefings before and act accordingly. Derek and Bob have little previous experience. To some extent therefore one finds responsibility for maintaining the text type falling on the old hands. However it need also be said that it is likely to be a regular feature of this kind of text that some of the participants are novices. Public relations professionals, designers and technical writers participate in briefings as regular parts of their jobs. Clients often do not. The consequences of this may well be that one should look to the activity of the regulars to show the generic features of this kind of interaction. It may well be however that it is not just familiarity that leads to development of genre, in that participants can take short cuts through the interaction in order to achieve their known aims as quickly and smoothly as possible. It may well be that constraints are imposed on the novices because of their lack of familiarity with the process. It may not lead to a genre as short cut, but it may produce a generic type of interaction due to the client's restricted goal and the limited number of ways, within the constraints of a meeting with a pro and a designer, available for reaching that goal. It is not as if the examples of briefings in this data will evidence incomplete or novice versions of a briefing genre. The next briefings done at Birmingham will almost certainly involve Frank and Juliana. Bob will be involved when the issue is collaboration with industry, and Derek when it is biotechnology. In other words it is a generic feature of the communicative event that the participants who are clients have roles of high status but limited experience. In Frank's words from Briefing 2, they must be kept `happy'.

The term `novice' is appropriate, however, in that Derek is demonstrably learning briefing technique in Briefing 1. He will become more responsible for publications in the field of Biology. Neither client in the Birmingham set up is present only to provide expert information. Both Bob and Derek have a need to develop professional communication skills.

Micro Analytic Variables in Briefings 1 & 2

Briefing 1

This is the shorter and seemingly more straightforward briefing of the two. In discourse terms this can be attributed to the low occurrence of decision making interaction, compared to Briefing 2. If one were amassing a list of predictive features to be found in a briefing then it would include the following.

1. Transfer of the current state of knowledge of the forthcoming document from client / pro to designer.
2. The client / pro would be expected predominantly to fill the role of primary knower (Berry 1981) and the designer secondary knower, although this need not be a hard and fast distinction. There are likely to be areas of talk where this role is either reversed or where designer and pro become primary knower and the client, as novice participant, becomes secondary knower.
3. Clarification requests and requests for information of a certain type from the designer.
4. Acknowledgements of received information from the designer.
5. One would expect an incomplete picture of the document to emerge at this stage, precisely because it is an early stage of the document design process. This last feature should be seen not just as a predictive feature of briefings but as a variable in the local management of briefings. It is a matter of choice whether to bring the designer in at an early stage or only to seek her help once the text has been agreed. This latter is the procedure adopted by the draft check document team (hereafter the FTM team).
6. A small number of participants
7. Face to face interaction. The presence of a mock up text seems optional. Frank works with one in briefing 2 but Derek does not.

8. A fair amount of agreement, in that the designer is being offered work to produce a design of a document for her client.
8. Few challenging moves (Burton 1980) and a relatively smooth flow of interaction.

As will be shown, most if not all of these attributes are features of the first briefing but are not regularly found in the second. The reason for this is that the information transferred by Derek and Frank in Briefing 1 maintains a largely non controversial status. Little of what either member of the Birmingham team states is challenged by the other team member. This is for two reasons. There has been prior talk on these issues between Derek and Frank, and secondly, Derek is largely in control of his own document, with Frank providing a guiding hand where necessary. Derek writes most of the text for his folder, or else commissions more detailed contributions from the Biology department.

Briefing 2

The case is quite different for Bob's document. It is Bob's job to get this document produced and wisely, though not obligatorily, he has commissioned Frank to write it for him. Bob therefore is not writing any of the text, or like Derek, providing any of the pictures. Derek has a specialist knowledge of Biology not available to Frank. There are areas where he will be sole primary knower in talk on his folder. Frank and Bob stand as equals in the university hierarchy and both are sensitive and aware of how to present the university to the outside world. If one splits their allegiances one might say that Frank is committed to pushing through a corporate image for the whole university and that this document will be a flagship for that approach; the figure head document of a family of corporate publications presenting Birmingham University to the outside world. Bob, as his talk in presentations has shown, is equally committed to a corporate approach but it is not first and foremost his task to accomplish it, rather he has to ensure that those he represents, the faculties across the university, especially science and engineering are treated well. In linguistic terms, that their face is protected.

Add to this background the fact that Frank has just produced a mock text outline for this document, and that he intends to use it as a framework for briefing Juliana and that Bob only received it yesterday and that the two of them have yet to exchange a word on the matter, and one can see that the stage is set for a more controversial and combative briefing than in Briefing 1. With this more particular knowledge of the background contextual environment one would be able to predict more of the occurring interaction for this briefing than previously. One would predict that items in the draft text would be up for negotiation in this meeting. One would predict some disagreement on the nature of the information to be used as a `briefing unit'.

6.2 Analysis of Briefing 1

Introduction

I have outlined the different circumstances of enactment for these two Briefings. What remains to be done is to give substance to these predictions through analysis that will illuminate the contrast between these two pieces of interaction as they occur locally, and the similarities that they share because they both belong to the social activity genre of briefings. Are we seeing different text types being used to effect the same social activity or are these two meetings even members of the same genre of text. If the claim that I am making, that these two texts do belong to the same genre, is true then the analysis must reveal what consistent features exist in both meetings if not in terms of sequential organization then in terms of functional elements.

Preliminaries

Little will be said at this stage about the key component of the interaction that divides these two pieces of interaction, decision making. That will be explored in depth when Briefing 2 is compared with the Draft Check in the following chapter. Here I will concentrate on examining the topic types to be found in the two events. Where the same or similar topic types can be identified then the unfolding of the interaction within those units will be examined for meaningful differences. The occurrence of different topic types in these two Briefings will also be accounted for in functional terms.

Topic Types in Briefing 1

The following range of topic types are recognisable in this briefing

Topic Types

Seek Information	4, 7, 10
Brief	1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13
Decision	9
Procedural	14, 15

Here is an example of each to show how these types can be justified from the data.

1. Seek Information

This is the topic type that is initiated by the designer. It is for her to be briefed and when necessary to request information that she feels she needs for her brief, or to request clarification of information that has been initiated by the Birmingham team but which remains unclear. Designer utterances are coded as clfyR when they refer to a specific issue that has already been raised in the meeting. When the designer raises a new issue or seeks information of a general kind then her utterances are coded as request.

One can represent this as a systemic choice request information

Designer --

seek clarification

Of course it isn't an either or choice. The selection depends on the ongoing state of the discourse and the kind of information the designer needs. Here is an example of the opening of a clarification request.

Designer Seek Clarification

J	clfyR	So within this general what I'm calling umbrella publication
F	ack	mmm
J	cont	Obviously there's going to be some reference to all these other areas as well
D	clfy	not necess [arily
F	clfy	[very very] light [very light
J	ack	very light]

(Tape 4a, Unit 4)

And here is a designer information request.

J	DP sugg	Did you want to talk about the content in more detail at all?
F	proc DP	Show her what you've done Derek

(Tape 4a, Unit 10)

Here are the figures for all the designer initiated topics in Briefing 1.

Designer initiated topics

Seek information	3
clarification request	2
information request	1

The designer is a minor initiator of topics, a minor controller of the discourse in Briefing 1. This may be a general feature of briefings or even a feature of briefings that go well - that the designer is receiving the information she needs without having to direct the talk in any particular direction.

2. Briefing Topics

Derek's topics, predictably, are briefing topics. A working definition of this kind of activity is that it must contain an inform from the briefer - who must be either client or pro in these meetings and a receipt marker from the recipient of that information - who must be the designer.

Here is an example.

D	inf	The purposes of our publication are first of all to attract collaboration
	confR	yes
J	conf	mm mm
D	inf	and it's in the area of bio technology under those three headings and
	result	so our target is predominantly industry
J	ack	mm mm
D	elab	industrial contacts that we already have or what we hope to generate
J	ack	yes

(Tape 4a, Unit 6)

This example shows the basic pattern of activity in this topic type. These topics are regularly the longest in Briefing 1. They are the default topic for this kind of interaction. Just as talk would revert to presentation topics in the presentation activity, naturally enough it reverts to briefing talk in a briefing.

The pattern of topic type development for Briefing 1 can be presented as follows.

		SEEK INFORMATION	
OPEN	BRIEF	PROCEDURAL ---	CLOSE
		DECISION	

Procedural topics will typically occur at the open and close of proceedings. The briefing topic is the default topic of the interaction. Seek information, procedural and decision making are the topic types that can interrupt the briefing activity. There will be an eventual return to briefing until all necessary matters have been dealt with and the activity can close.

It is arguable that even in Briefing 2 that the briefing topic is the default topic and this is one reason for recognising Briefing 2 as a member of the same genre as Briefing 1. Whereas Briefing 1 is largely constituted by the default topic, as one would expect, this is not the case, as will be shown, in Briefing 2

Client Topics

Briefing	4
Procedural	1

This shows the key features of the role of the client in Briefing 1. Derek is responsible in this meeting for providing much of the briefing information to Juliana. He also initiates the briefing close down topic type - which is one kind of procedural topic. Here is the instance.

3. Procedural Topics

D	confR	But is is does that give you?
J	conf	It does yes.
	pos ev	That's fine
F	proc DP	Is that enough for you Juliana if we come back and do Bob's?

(Tape 4a, Unit 14)

The procedure is to enquire whether the designer is happy with her brief. This gives her the option of requesting more information - an option she takes up at the end of Briefing 2. It also obviously signals the readiness of at least one member of the briefing team to close. This allows the other member to raise outstanding issues or even the initiator of the close down topic to raise one more mentionable before closure actually occurs[4]. This occurs here as Derek uses the slot provided by the designer's refusal of the option to request more information. Also noticeable here is the pro taking over the role initiated by Derek of closing the briefing down. It is arguable that this is seen as a '+ power' role attribute and that Frank is unwilling to relinquish overall control of the meeting, even temporarily. On a contingent level one could account for Frank's behaviour as due to his function as facilitator. He sees this meeting through two briefing sessions. He not only wants to oversee the close down of Briefing 1 but to move talk on to Briefing 2.

4. Decision Topics

This is a major difference in topic type activity between Briefings 1 and 2.
There is only one decision topic in this brief and it is initiated and developed by Frank. In this instance the decision topic can be recognised a) by holding up the ongoing briefing b) by challenging the content of part of the ongoing briefing and c) by proposing an alternative course of action. Here is the opening section of this topic.

F	DP	How do we control what they put in?
	elab	Those that want to retain their indi individuality, usually means they want to produce something that is bloody awful. And stick it in our nice folder
D	ack	It's a good point Frank. .
F	DP	Will it be some kind of deal if you get our folder you meet certain minimum production standards?

(Tape 4a, Unit 9)

This topic opens with a question that challenges Derek's brief on how the document can be used. That this is a challenge and not just a request for clarification is made clear by the follow up which provides a basis for the challenge, a negative evaluation of the kind of document use that Derek has been describing. Derek acknowledges the point, and Frank continues with a decision proposal which is a suggestion for how to avoid the situation described in his earlier challenge and basis. The range of decision making activity, as it occurs in draft review and the second briefing, will be the main focus for chapter 7.

The Pro's topics

Briefing 7
Decision 1

In terms of topic numbers Frank appears the key player in this briefing. This is also borne out by the sequencing of these topics.

Topic Sequence

Table 6.1. The Topic Sequence in Briefing 1.

1	Pro Brief
2	Pro Brief
3	Pro Brief
4	Designer Seek Information
5	Pro Brief
6	Client brief
7	Designer Seek Information
8	Client Brief
9	Pro Decision
10	Designer Seek Information

11 Client Brief
12 Pro Brief
Break for Introductions
13 Pro Brief
14 Procedural
15 Procedural

It is Frank who opens the briefing and sets the scene for Derek's contribution. It is Frank also who at least initiates most of the later briefing topics, ensuring the briefing is completed, even though he isn't the main information contributor for these topics. Beyond the opening, however, Frank's topics are short compared to Derek's. It is Derek who supplies the bulk of the briefing information to Juliana.

5. The Briefing Topic

Now I wish to look more closely at the kinds of interaction that I am naming a briefing topic. I want to examine the common patterns of interaction, occurring within this meeting that can be identified as belonging to this topic type.

Types of Briefing Topic

Firstly I will outline the range of topics that a document design briefing can deal with. Then I wish to look at differences between pro and client initiated topics and briefing topics where initiator and main contributor are not the same person.

A basic split is in terms of general or specific information being conveyed. General briefing topics can be further split into those relating to purpose and those relating to content. Purpose briefs can be subdivided into those dealing with the document itself, its relation to others, its uses or its effects.

Those topics that relate specifically to the document in hand split into categories such as content, purpose, format, and use. Content briefs can be further specified as dealing with sections, page formats, illustrations, words, or the cover. In Davies terms, these are the information constituents, the semantic slots that are available within a briefing activity.
These are not meant to constitute an exhaustive list but to indicate the range of subjects dealt with in briefing topics in the public relations data.

Table 6.2. Semantic Options for the Briefing Topic Type

general	purpose	in itself relation to others use
		effect
	description	

specific

content

page format
sections
illustrations
words
cover

purpose
format
use

These items can be seen as the semantic elements that are available in a briefing topic type. There are restraints on the sequential patterning of interaction that can enact a briefing and additionally there are restraints on the subject matter of a briefing. This issue of semantics will be returned to at greater length in Part 2 of this thesis, when technical writing briefings and draft reviews will be dealt with.

Interactional Patterns

A look at the briefing topics from an interactional perspective will show the range of regularly occurring patterns in the unfolding of briefing talk within this document design process. First, the patterns in the briefing units in Briefing 1 that are produced by the client and by the pro can be compared to establish some generic features of doing a briefing. Secondly. these sequential patterns can be compared with those in Briefing 2. It should then be possible to see what features they share; to see if there is a nucleus of interaction that constitutes a briefing and to see something of the range of variation that is contingently allowable while a piece of interaction remains in genre. Furthermore, the functions performed by regularly occurring patterns of interaction can be identified. These functions may occur in both Briefings, albeit with different textual shape. This will then provide evidence that the same social activity can be enacted with quite different linguistic coding.

The Pro Briefing Topics

In order to provide the necessary background information for the briefing, Frank creates an information unit with a problem - solution text pattern.

F	inf	we really do not have at present any any printed
	[SIT]	material of a general commercial nature to support kind of work
	result	we have to
J	ack	mm hmm
F	cont	=fall back on things like post graduate
	[PROB]	prospectuses,
	neg ev	which are not suitable. [1]
	inf	The vision is that we will create a family of
	[SOL]	mutually supportive documents
J	ack	mm hmm

(Tape 4a, Unit 1)

This provides an overall general purpose for these documents; to fill a perceived need. This is followed by a very general description of both documents.

The discoursal patterns available to both client and pro for producing briefing units in this briefing are as follows.

Inform [+ pos ev / result /upshot/ elaboration] ---- Ack.

The items in brackets I consider to be optional. Not optional as in giving the speaker a free choice, but optional depending on the particular briefing item and what needs to be said about it. Optional also in that although an inform item is necessary for any brief, any further information may not be.

Here are some examples of the construction of a brief unit made by the pro.

1. Inform + Elaboration.

F	inf	Erm, one which we'll obviously come back to because it's Bob's, is a very general, not much more than a coffee book kind of thing
J	ack	mm
F	elab	=that has a simple message which is that [1] Birmingham Research is high quality; being associated with it is good for you.
J	ack	mm hmm

(Tape 4a, Unit 2)

Frank informs Juliana about Bob's brochure and then adds some extra information, an elaboration of his main point. This receives an acknowledgement from Juliana and the briefing unit is complete.

2. Inform + Purpose + Positive Evaluation

F	inf	=very light on the words, heavy on pictures, images, impressions.
	purpose	So it can go to everybody from the Chamber of Research Council to a chairman of a company,
J	ack	mm
F	cont	=to a technical director everything.
	pos ev	warm feeling stuff
J	ack	mmm

(Tape 4a, Unit 2)

Here the pattern is inform plus purpose plus positive evaluation. There is no restriction to only one item being added on to the inform. Again, the designer's necessary response is to acknowledge receipt of this information.

3. Moving from General to Specific Briefing Information

Unit 1 is a general background briefing topic so not surprisingly, we find a number of ways of presenting relevant information to the designer. As the pro's briefing develops, in Units 2 and 3, we find more specific information being transferred. Frank describes the folder to Juliana in the following way.

F	inf	is a is a folder which is the generic bio technology folder
J	ack	mm mm
F	inf	front cover obviously close

		relationship with the other stuff we're talking about
	inf	into which there are three, four pages of A4, [1] A3 folded inserts each one dealing with the relevant one of the three branches [of
D	o comp	[Bio] medicine, bioscience and biochemical engineering [2]
J	clfyR	Biomedicine, bioscience, ..
D	clfy	And biochemical engineering. [1]

(Tape 4a, Unit 3)

The description is from general to specific. It is constructed of what, from an interactional perspective, need only be considered as a single inform or a related set of informing moves. More will be said in part two of this thesis about the rhetorical structuring and semantic content of these longer turns. Frank describes the folder, then the front cover and then what is inserted in the front cover. As part of the briefing team, as Frank is describing his document we find Derek other completing Frank's informs. We see Juliana assuring her receipt of the necessary information by means of a clarification request. This renders an acknowledge move unnecessary here.

4. Inform + Contrast + Upshot

Frank continues this opening brief by turning his attention to the briefing topic type semantic element, how the document is to be used. We find an inform + contrast + upshot pattern to the information unit.

F	inf	=Um this is the document which Derek or others who know what they're

		talking about use
J	ack	yeah
F	contrast	whereas someone not knowing what they're talking about might use Bob's brochure
J	ack	mm hmm
F	upshot	so that Derek would use Bob's brochure when he's selling engineering or [1] um history for that matter
J	ack	mm hmm
F	cont	=you know the total research package

(Tape 4a, Unit 3)

Briefing Units

Clearly then, although the inform - acknowledge can be seen as a bare minimum requirement for performing a briefing unit, it is unlikely to be enough. More extensive information is seen as necessary and this is provided by extending the information unit in one way or another, though a problem - solution pattern, a contrast pattern or result pattern. It is this extendable inform plus unit that I am calling a briefing unit. It is this that constitutes an available piece of information that can be used by the designer to inform the next stage of the document design process. That is, for her alone, or with her team of workers, to design draft text for presentation to the client team.

Other Briefing Unit Options

In Unit 5 the briefing unit takes yet another form. Here it a hypothetical narrative regarding the way Derek might use the two documents.

F inf So what I think if you envisage the

		that' the coffee table book
J	ack	[yes
F	inf	which] and I guess when Derek goes into the company
J	ack	mmm
F	cont	[1] =He might only have his own
	reason	cos it's getting down to quite detailed and there's no point in having
	inf	but you might just leave that and hope it'll sit in the board room] for
J	ack	[yes yes
F	cont	a bit] or in the reception desk

(Tape 4a, Unit 5)

This follows on from Juliana's Seek Information topic in which her view of the link between the two documents had to be realigned with the Birmingham view. This is a microanalytically available feature of briefings too; that the person being briefed does not have the right to convert her clients to her view of the document. At present, in the briefing stage of proceedings, they do have the right to align her views with theirs however. This of course changes a little once the issues under consideration are the designer's own contributions; her draft spreads or her mock up brochure.

The Upshot Confirmation Request

Apart from receipt markers such as acknowledgement or clarification request there is one other move regularly performed by the designer in response to the receipt of briefing units throughout this briefing. That is to produce an upshot confirmation request. This is a discourse feature produced across the document design process by those on the receiving end of new information. Here is an example.

J	Upshot	
	Conf R	It's almost a sort of background information +really to the detailed leaflets or brochures or folders that we're printing
F	chk	er up front I would say
J	ack	yeah

(Tape 4a, Unit 5)

Juliana provides a candidate interpretation of what Frank has told her. This is provided for him to confirm or refute. If it is confirmed then this can count as the designer's receipt marker of the information unit. This is a common discourse move in both brief and draft check. If it is refuted then the need for more information, packaged differently, to make the briefing unit successful is apparent.

Another Pro Briefing Strategy

Towards the end of Briefing 1 we see the pro not providing the brief but eliciting the brief out of his client colleague.

F	conf req	How many words have we got for each folder, er for each leaflet, Derek?
D	conf	My first drafts are giving me about two hundred words

(Tape 4a, Unit 12)

Frank is aware it seems of the information still likely to be of use to Juliana and seeks to extract it from Derek. Above the technique is to question Derek directly. In his next topic initiation Frank uses a more indirect method.

F	inf	I'm trying to get a feel for how] many words on on a four sided thing
J	rep	Well I think
	confR	Derek you were saying there were four or five of those?
D	conf	yes four of five
J	inf	so we're talking about a thousand words

(Tape 4a, Unit 13)

Arguably Frank isn't briefing at all here but seeking clarification of information for himself. In either case the necessary information comes from the designer rather than from Derek for the designer. In either case too it serves to show information receipt on the part of the designer which is the basic requirement of this activity.

Client Briefing Topics in Briefing 1

To show generic similarities in performing a brief a comparison of briefing topic types initiated by the client and the pro will now be made. The analysis should also display differences in approach that arise from differences in role and in expertise between the Birmingham team members. The following is a list of matters likely to affect the client's handling of briefing topics.

Unfamiliarity with Staging

Derek's first topic initiation does not occur until topic 6; after the pro has introduced and launched the brief by providing some general information to the designer. One signal of Derek's lack of familiarity with this discourse genre, is that he seeks permission from Frank to open an extended turn in a briefing topic type. Here are three examples of this phenomenon.

D	per req	Can I
F	per	yeah, go ahead Derek sure
D	per req	Could I
F	proc sugg	You talk about your thing [now
D	per req	May] I talk about [my thing
	reas	cos I jotted a few notes
F	per	yeah that's best] yeah

(Tape 4a, Unit 6)

In Unit 10 again we find

D	per req	Can I go?
F	cont	that's the best thing yeah
D	meta S	yeah well, Frank and I have agreed that each leaflet
J	ack	mm hmm
D	cont	will umm comprise the following

(Tape 4a, Unit 10)

And

D	per req	Can I go [on
F	per	Yeah carry on] yes yes

(Tape 4a, Unit 13)

Derek knows that he is required to inform the designer. He has brought notes to help him. What he doesn't know, or does not appear to know, are the staging rules or norms for this kind of interaction. He positions Frank as the facilitator of the talk and checks that the time is now right to pass a chunk of information on to the designer.

Attesting the Status of the Information he Provides

The client also uses a great deal of `meta talk' to explain to Juliana just what the status is of the information he is supplying. In Unit 6 the permission request is followed by

D	per req	May] I talk about [my thing
	reas	cos I jotted a few notes
F	per	yeah that's best] yeah
D	elab	they're based on considerable interaction with Frank already about this
	explain	cos we've talked .
J	ack	yes
D	cont	to each other about it
	inf	The purposes of our publication are first of all to attract collaboration
	confR	yes
J	conf	mm mm
D	inf	and it's in the area of bio technology

(Tape 4a, Unit 6)

Having sought permission Derek then establishes the status of his information as the outcome of talk with Frank. This means that it has the status of team talk. In other words, it is the agreed Birmingham position at this time. That doesn't mean that the position can't change or that either participant can't change his mind. It does mean, however, that the designer is hearing the current agreed state of knowledge. In Derek's case one can assign the foregrounding of this information to his novice status as a briefing team member.

Further evidence that this issue of information status is of key importance is to be found by comparing what Derek does in Briefing 1 with Frank's use of meta talk in Briefing 2. Here it is the pro who foregrounds the fact that the document he wishes to use to brief Juliana does not represent the current state of shared knowledge at Birmingham. And indeed it is just this uncertain status of the briefing document that causes so much of the difficulty in that activity.

One quality then of the information to be given to a designer is that it should be the most up to date shared views of the briefing team - whether more than one member of that team is present or not. One can take this as a default state in that shifts away from it need to be accounted for and dealt with. On the other hand Derek's meticulous concern for the state of the information he is transmitting - even when it is of the required shared up to the minute nature may be taken as another sign of his novice status in this kind of activity.

Throughout this opening briefing topic Derek attests the nature of the information that he is giving to the designer.

D	inf	Secondarily we want to draw attention of research institutes and possibly other universities to major strengths
	[supp]	and again it relates very much to the to the kind of ethos the setting of what you've talked about there Frank.
	upshot	Um so that's a prime

(Tape 4a, Unit 6)

Derek provides information and then supports it by using a Meta Inform to link what he is saying to points already made by Frank. Thus even if this hasn't been explicitly agreed beforehand Derek provides good evidence that what he is saying has the status of team information.

Each briefing unit is either accompanied by a meta comment that assures the status of the information by linking it to something Frank has said or, as in the next example, to something Frank has in mind.

D	meta inf	A secondary purpose, again complementing I think what Frank has in mind for the general publication
J	ack	mm hmm

D inf =we want to raise general awareness of the Biotechnology potential
(Tape 4a, Unit 6)

Another alternative is for Derek to signal that his information has no sanction as yet from the pro.

D meta Inf And the final thing is I've put this down Frank I've never actually said this to you,
inf a boost for internal ego
supp but it's not a long way from some of the points you were [making in your general introduction
F ack mm mm mm]
(Tape 4a, Unit 6)

In the above example he first flags the lack of sanction and then provides support for why that sanction should be given. In each example where Derek was in fact fairly sure of his information status there were no comments from Frank. Here, however, where Derek introduces a point of his own, Frank does give his approval. Noticeably, it is Frank who provides the acknowledgement. Derek is ensuring the status of the information at the same time as he gives it to Juliana.

This must count as a contingent complication of a brief because it is by no means essential to have two people conduct it. The meta talk highlighted above is an optional functional element of a briefing. The status of the information given in a briefing should surely be as reliable and agreed upon as possible. Even if only one person was briefing it is likely that s/he would be briefing on behalf of other team members so I think that this can be viewed as a generic quality of the information that is to be produced in a briefing. Frank and Juliana take that status to be understood unless otherwise stated, as will be shown when Briefing 2 is described. Derek, as a novice participant, draws attention to the status of what he says whether it is controversial or not.

When Derek does introduce information that is unchecked by Frank, and unlikely to meet his approval, it leads to a shift from the default topic of briefing to a decision making cycle.

D	meta S	Now Frank, that I haven't actually talked with you about yet
F	ack	No yep
D	meta S	You you'll disagree I'm sure [1]
	inf	but that's sort of taking this package as a whole Juliana
J	ack	mm hmm yes
D	elab	but the great thing about the package is that it can be used in toto but it can also be broken down.

(Tape 4a, Unit 6)

Derek presents his briefing unit and is then confronted by Frank's display of disagreement in the form of a decision proposal which initiates a decision topic type.

F	DP	How do we control what they put in? [2]
	elab	Those that want to retain their indi individuality, usually means they want to produce something that is bloody awful. And stick it in our nice folder [1]

(Tape 4a, Unit 9)

This is a good example of a pattern that is repeated and developed in the next briefing. The need for decision making is a product of the uncertain status of the information being used to brief the designer. Furthermore it is decision making between those participants who have the right to determine the status of that information, namely the Birmingham team members; Derek the client, and Frank the pro.

In his next briefing topic type Derek is commenting on the content of his brochure. This appears to be safer ground than its flexibility of use. Once again though, at the opening of the topic type, the status of the information is flagged.

D	per req	Can I go?
F	cont	that's the best thing yeah
D	meta S	yeah well, Frank and I have agreed that each leaflet
J	ack	mm hmm
D	cont	will umm comprise the following um can I perhaps I
	metaI	can pull out I brought quite a lot of things with me I don't want but it

		will comprise a brief description.
J	ack	mm mm
D	inf	=in each leaflet there will be four or five brief descriptions [1] and they will comprise for example that I,

(Tape 4a, Unit 11)

The topic opens with the regular permission request - which is only found near the opening of Derek's briefings, when Derek is about to take responsibility for delivering a sizeable chunk of information to the designer. This is then followed by the meta language on the status of the information. Only then is Derek ready to start informing.

The diagram below is a representation of the optional path to enacting a brief that is regularly taken by this client.

[per req + meta L] + inf

The optional elements of Derek's briefing units have now been dealt with. It remains to look at the core of their enactment and to explore similarities and differences between his and Frank's. Then the analysis will be widened somewhat to include Briefing 2.

Obligatory Elements of Client's Briefs

Derek's briefing units are long. He initiates fewer than the pro but is the main provider of information both in the briefs he initiates and in the later ones, where the pro initiates with a request for information of some kind from Derek largely for the designer's benefit. The construction of briefing units within these briefing topic types is of a similar nature to those outlined for the pro. Thus, in the long 6th topic we find the following.

1. Information plus reform plus elaboration

D	inf	The purposes of our publication are first of all to attract collaboration
	confR	yes
J	conf	mm mm
D	inf	and it's in the area of bio technology under those three headings and
	reform	so our target is predominantly industry
J	ack	mm mm
D	elab	industrial contacts that we already have or what we hope to generate
J	ack	yes

(Tape 4a, Unit 6)

Derek's uncertainty is indicated here by his confirmation request to the designer that he is doing the right thing. I wish to focus now less on Derek's idiosyncratic style of briefing and more on the range of acceptable generic patterns for the transfer of the briefing information, within a briefing unit. Here Derek provides the information and then reformulates what he has said, adding an elaboration and receiving acknowledgement. The reformulation also specifies the kind of collaboration the university is seeking to attract.

2. Inform + Upshot

D	inf	Secondarily we want to draw attention of research institutes and possibly other universities to major strengths and again it relates very much to the to the kind of ethos the setting of what you've talked about there Frank.
	upshot	Um so that's a prime
J	ack	mm mm mm mm
D	cont	=purpose.

(Tape 4a, Unit 6)

Here, the upshot adds a gloss to the information given in the inform move. In the former example the reformulation was a rephrasing of the information already given in the inform move. In both cases we see Derek structuring his own discourse, drawing attention to both the points he has made so far as being the prime purpose. This could have been confusing as he introduced this second point with 'secondarily'. However he continues, after establishing the joint status of both these items as prime purpose, as follows.

3. Inform + Result

D	meta inf	A secondary purpose, again complementing I think what Frank has

		in mind for the general publication
J	ack	mm hmm
D	inf	=we want to raise general awareness of the bio technology potential
	res	so this will be as it were untargetted, well,less targeted than our mail shot and all the companies that we can pull out of the umm international directories and all that sort of thing
J	ack	mm

(Tape 4a, Unit 6)

He frames the next item of information, first as a secondary purpose - so Derek is giving the most important information first, and then as still being team talk, something Frank would agree with. Once the information has been attested, Derek immediately continues with a `so' clause that provides a result or consequence of this secondary purpose.

Derek's next briefing topic type is actually called for by Juliana in an information seeking topic. Derek then opens his topic up with a permission request and a meta comment on the status of the information to come. This is previously agreed information, so negotiation between Frank and Derek should be at a minimum and Derek allowed to structure his brief as he finds suitable. During this brief Derek is showing example illustrations and the like to Juliana so there is a non verbal element to it not recordable on audio tape.

Derek proceeds by interweaving talk that relates to the brochure with talk that relates to what Derek is doing with it. Thus we find the following, all I think constituting one briefing unit. It repeats, with variation, the basic information structure described earlier of Inform + Reformulation

D	meta S	yeah well, Frank and I have agreed that each leaflet
J	ack	mm hmm
D	cont	will umm comprise the following um can I perhaps I
	metaI	can pull out I brought quite a lot of things with me I don't want but it will comprise a brief description
J	ack	mm mm
D	inf	=in each leaflet there will be four or five brief descriptions [1] and they will comprise for example that I,
	comment	I'm now starting to get all the stuff [together
J	ack	yes yes]
D	inf cont	=about perhaps 200 words
J	ack	mm hmm
D	chk	right
J	ack	mm mm
D	inf	Some illustrations,
	Meta I	I'll show you some examples of illustrations
J	ack	yes
D		=in a moment.

	inf cont	And here most importantly a brief statement of subject area, contact, telephone number right?
J	ack	mm hmm
D	upshot	so for each of those four five areas in each of those leaflets we don't necessarily see a slavish adhesion to exactly the same but that that's the core material
J	ack	mm hmm

(Tape 4a, Unit 11)

Derek starts to construct a briefing unit which will describe each leaflet within the brochure. He interrupts himself to comment first on what he is doing - pulling out a few examples - and then secondly to comment on how his work is progressing, 'I'm starting to get all the stuff together'. Only then does Derek inform Juliana of what each leaflet will comprise. This is done in three separate informs, linked together as being a description of each leaflet. Derek informs there will be 200 words and this is acknowledged. He then moves on to illustrations, makes a comment on what he will do and then informs about the contact. Derek completes the brief unit by providing an upshot of what he has just said - again using a `so' discourse marker to indicate the relation of this information to what has gone before. His upshot is that what he has described is the core material for each leaflet. Within this upshot Derek takes the opportunity to qualify the degree of homogeneity in each leaflet, thus leaving the designer a little freer to manoeuvre.

The inform sections are simple, complicated only by Derek's references to what he is doing. This too is a complication for the analysis, but not necessarily for the recipient. The briefing unit then, rather than being elaborated in any way, is made up of three simple inform sections which together constitute a briefing unit for the content of the leaflets.

Briefing Recipient Moves

Apart from providing the necessary acknowledgement signs, the designer limits herself to such moves as the following.

J	confR	So you see it more illustrations um than possibly photographs of apparatus.
D	conf	[yes.
J	rep	Did] you see it more in that sort
D	elab	It may be that one or two of them might be photographs of apparatus
J	ack	mm hmm

(Tape 4a, Unit 11)

Having heard the briefing units on the type of illustration Derek plans to use, Juliana draws her own conclusion and puts this forward for confirmation by Derek. Here what she says is confirmed by Derek and qualified by him too.

Conclusion

This is a complete summary then of the interactional patterns in the briefing topic types that are initiated by the client. I have tried to show idiosyncratic features that are due to participant characteristics, and features that are due to the nature of a briefing with a novice team member. I have emphasised the basic patterns of performing a brief, its generic sequential structure, that is evidenced in the structure of the interaction constructed by both the client and the pro.

What one sees here is a less highly structured activity than the presentation. There are fewer fixed moves and fewer recognisable generic patterns to the activity. That said, there is a clear orientation to providing a chunk of information, elaborating in a restricted set of ways, if considered useful, and then receiving some marker of acknowledgement before going any further. Both types of interaction have a default topic; the presentation and the briefing unit. Moves away from this topic occur when problems arise. Once these problems have been dealt with the default topic is re-established.

A discourse analytic approach, applied within a topic type framework, does allow a generic sequential structure to become evident for different types of discourse within the document design process. This loose sense of generic structure can then be used to account for variations in the encoding of a social activity.

For presentations, the social activity / discourse genre relation seems very close to one to one. Here, even in the first briefing conducted by two team members one sees quite a deal of variation in the discourse coding of the social activity, a number of ways of doing the same thing. Both members of the Birmingham team do noticeably use the same text type pattern to encode the briefing activity they perform. Both produce briefing topics as a default feature of the talk and this topic has a structure which, in both participants' cases, is built around inform moves, plus some kind of additional element and leading to a receipt marker from the briefing recipient. In the second briefing there is a move away from this text type, but not from the activity type of briefing. It is this issue that will be addressed in the next part of this Chapter

The next section will examine the client briefing units, the strategies he employs, the discourse patterns that are used, and the range of responses from the designer to show that there is a generic pattern to enacting briefing units in Briefing 1 and to show role based differences in their construction.

6.3 Briefing 2: A Contrast to Briefing 1

This is a much longer briefing in terms of time, turns and topic types. This is largely due to the amount of time spent on decision making. In the next chapter this decisioning talk will be examined in detail, and compared with decision talk in a different but related social activity, the draft review. Here it will be outlined as a differentiating feature in what seem to be texts of the same social activity type, namely a briefing.

Above, in the course of describing Briefing 1, much has been said about the nature of the information that provides the key elements of a briefing unit. In Briefing 2, although the overall purpose of the meeting is to do a brief, this topic type will be interrupted for a number of reasons. For example, by information requests of one kind or another from the designer. This is a feature that Briefing 2 shares with Briefing 1. Chat phases (Lampi 1986), issues that either don't deal with the brochure or related work at all, or deal with it in a fashion designed to elicit laughter, will also provide natural breaks in the ongoing briefing talk. The main obstacle to the smooth running of briefing topics in Briefing 2 however is the status of the information that it deals with. I have shown how in Briefing 1 Derek regularly foregrounded the status of the information he was providing as shared team opinion. On the one occasion that this was not the case decision making activity occurred, interrupting the flow of briefing topics. A similar pattern of activity is a regular feature of Briefing 2. Frank's information on Bob's brochure, the briefing material for this activity, has not yet been attested, agreed upon by present briefing team members.

The social activity that this meeting enacts is, however, still a briefing. Firstly, because it is referred to as such by the participants. Secondly, its differences to Briefing 1 do not lead to totally different patterns of interaction. The differences can largely be accounted for in terms of the information status deficiency outlined above. Where no problem is seen to exist, the briefing topic becomes the regularly occurring default topic that we expect to find in a briefing. It occurs as briefing discussion rather than briefing information units that were the case for briefing 1. This choice between discursive and monologic realisations will be dealt with in detail in part two of this thesis. Other reasons for differences are contingent; due to local variations in the context of the two documents. For Briefing 2, for example, Frank has a mock up of his draft text, an outline version for Juliana to work her designs onto. Derek did not have this. Indeed, once Derek found out that Frank had this, at the end of Briefing 2 he offers Juliana something similar.

D	meta I	The second point is
	fg	do you require,
	inf	now Frank produced this rather nice sketch outline for you and
J	ack	mmm
D	inf	I I didn't produce something like that I could quite easily do so.
	offer	Do you want to see the sort of wording the sort of pictures or not at this stage?
J	rep	I mean certainly a photocopy of that initial page that we [went through
D	ack	yes]
J	cont	would be would be good.

(Tape 4b, Unit 35)

We see the novice learning from the expert. The presence of a mock up text has an effect on the interaction as we shall see. It tends to focus attention on each item in a more detailed fashion - whereas Derek was talking about his brochure in more general terms, rarely with page by page outlined information. However perhaps a more general difference is that this is a briefing carried out by an expert. It is a regular part of the pro's job to do briefings. Juliana is also an expert in the sense that she is a regular recipient of briefing information. The novices, the clients, are still present. Their role is largely in the decision making processes that determine the actual information content that is to be transferred to Juliana. Bob does not provide briefing units, however, in the way that Derek did in Briefing 1. Here the briefing units are all initiated by the pro. Sometimes there is no structured briefing unit as in Briefing 1 simply because there is a draft text of the document present which elicits comment by itself, or because the outcome of the decisioning process can in itself become the briefing information.

Briefing 1 has been described as a fair example of a team brief carried out by novice plus expert without any guiding documentation. Some differences in Briefing 2 will be due to the brief being carried out only by an expert and by the presence of a guiding document. The key differences, however, are due to the nature of the information to be used for this briefing, and its status as suitable briefing material. This information problem is largely dealt with through decision making sequences in the first half of Briefing 2. In the second half, the pattern of interaction changes and what both Frank and Juliana refer to as a `briefing discussion' gets underway.

Topic Types in Briefing 2

The following range of topic types are recognisable in Briefing 2.

Table 6.3. Topic Types in Briefing 2

Topic Type	Unit Number	Total
Procedurals	1 3 4 6 11 20 32 33	8
Hybrid Brief- Proc	5 7	2
Brief	14 23 28	3
Hybrid Brief- D.Make	21 22 25 26 29 30	6
Decision	2 9 10 12 13 15 16 17 18 19	10
Chat	2 occasions	2
Seek Information	8 24 27 31	4
Total		35

These figures bear out the importance of decision making in this interaction. These topics will be analysed in the next chapter of this thesis. Here, I will first give examples of the topic types found in this data and show how they vary from those found in Briefing 1. What can be seen from the table above is that the clear cut topic type division that has provided a successful basis for analysing presentation data will not strictly hold up across the briefing material. We are dealing with the same range of topic types in Briefing 2 as in Briefing 1, with the addition of decision making. The repercussions of the need for this topic type are that differences between briefing units and other key constituents of the activity become blurred. Briefing merges either with procedural activity or decision making activity. How and why this should occur will be the main focus of this section of the thesis.

Micro Analytical Features of Briefing 2

One features of this talk made apparent by this level of analysis is that it is a framed activity. It has both opening and closing procedural topics. Talk goes on around it at both the beginning and the end, but this is a framed activity which gives it some qualification to be regarded as a speech event. Briefing 1 also closes with a procedural topic but opens directly with a general briefing topic from the pro.

The designer function is similar to that in Briefing 1. Nearly all her topic initiations are information seeking. Thus there is a continuity of purpose in the behaviour of the briefing recipient in both these pieces of interaction.

The decision making topics, totally absent from Briefing 1, concern issues that have to be dealt with before a briefing can have occurred. They are topics that either directly present the client's negative evaluation of the document or which arise as a means of settling issues he has raised, (Units 12 and 13). They are topics that arise because of the lack of a previously agreed shared position between client and pro. The consequence of this are that even when there is a return to briefing activity, from Unit 20 onwards, it is briefing that is carried out as a discussion, with a decision making element built in, rather than as briefing carried out as an elaborated information unit, built on prior agreement of the Birmingham team position.

Topic Type Description

1. Seek Information

The Seek Information topic type is a common feature of both briefings. It will not be dealt with here in detail but its presence and common function is evidence of briefing activity occurring.

2. Procedural

In Briefing 1 the only kind of procedural topic is

the closure. In Briefing 2 there is a flurry of procedural topics at the opening of the episode. As these set the framework for much of the interaction that follows, at least in the first half of this briefing they repay some detailed attention.
One basic distinctive feature of a procedural topic type is that it will require more of a response from its recipient than a mere acknowledge. In terms of actual subject material it may not be that different from other topic types. A further feature that must emerge is that this kind of topic will effect the way the ongoing talk proceeds. It is less concerned with giving information or questioning information than with determining what is an appropriate or acceptable way for the talk to unfold at this time and place.

A. Opening Topics

There is something in common between the opening of Briefing 1 and Briefing 2. Both open by mentioning what has been done. Brief 1 sets the scene for providing Juliana with new briefing information by stating the shared information state currently in place. It quickly goes on however to state the background problem to which the production of the two documents is seen as an answer, and then into a general description of these two documents. In Briefing 2 it is noticeable in the first case that the talk is directed not at Juliana, but at Bob, the client for this brochure and a recent arrival at the meeting. It is natural that Bob should be brought up to date with what has already been said. However it is not only this first procedural topic that is addressed to him, but topics 3, 4 and 6 also. Here is that first procedural topic.

F	Meta I	Well what we did at the beginning,
	inf	I erm [1] briefed Juliana on the concept of the parent publication of yours
B	ack	mmm
F	inf	and just described it as much as we talked - I haven't looked at the data or anything we did the other day,
	inf	er and all these off shoots of which Derek's is one but by no means we hope [the last
B	ack	yeah]
F	inf	er And we've gone through Derek's in a bit of detail.
F	inf	All I've said about yours really is that is that we envisage it as heavy on what we're now calling atmospheric pictures, light on text, coffee table, all purpose, all audience general message is we've got high quality research and it's good for you to be associated with us.
	confReq	Is that fair enough?
	inf	Bob and I haven't talked since I did a thing here which was the first stab [1] at how the text might work. Erm not to get the text agreed cos there's a lot of work to do on it
	inf	but just whether it was [1] sufficient for a discussion document for briefing Juliana.
F	el DP	What do you think Bob, is it near enough for that purpose?
B	DPacc	Yes,

(Tape 4b, Unit 1)

We find a key feature of this topic type in Frank's confR move, that looks for agreement from Bob that what he has said so far is a shared position. In the second part of this topic Frank explains to Juliana that the text he wishes to use as a briefing document has not yet been discussed at all by Bob and himself. Frank then readdresses Bob with his procedural proposal to not talk about the text but to use it as `a discussion document for briefing Juliana'.

It is conceivable that Frank, as an experienced briefer, realises that the kind of interaction that constituted a briefing in Briefing 1 will not be easily replicable here. Frank hopes for an easy passage for his words but in any case sees what will follow as a `briefing discussion' - which might be regarded as a sub type of brief; one in which the necessary briefing units will not be delivered as established chunks of information, as we saw Derek do, both by himself and with Frank's help. Instead, the information required by Juliana will emerge as the product of discussion between all the interested parties in producing this brochure, who are all present at this meeting. An indication that Frank will not get a smooth ride comes straight away when Bob, having just agreed to Frank's proposal, opens the next topic with a negative evaluation and an expansion that will lead to a decision proposal and a decision topic type.

B	inf	the theme we're adopting here about measuring the quality of research
F	ack	mmm
B	neg ev	I slightly worry whether that puts us on the wrong foot in the document overall,

(Tape 4b, Unit 2)

Frank's next procedural topic, Unit 4, bears relation to those found in presentation meetings. There are some common features to the interaction being described here that cut right across genre boundaries.

F	perReq	Can I pass this round then and we'll use it?
	DP	
B	DPacc	[yeah yeah yeah]
F	cont	for the basis of the discussion.
J	ack	thank you

(Tape 4b, Unit 4)

Frank's permission request regarding how to proceed is agreed to. This ought to signal the start of the briefing proper. Unit 1 can be seen as a pre-opening procedural topic and Units 3 and 4 here as the opening procedural topic for the conduct of a brief. What happens next is a display that this briefing will be problematical. Briefing topics are initiated but cannot be completed. Instead they revert to doing procedural work.

B. Hybrid Briefing - Procedural Topics

There is a five second pause following the above opening boundary exchange. Following this, the next topic opens as a briefing topic might, by establishing the status of a piece of information as already shared.

F	inf	Well I think we've priced it for 16 pages self colour self cover
J	ack	mm hmm mm hmm

[2]		
F	cont	full colour throughout I think,
[1]		
	confR	I seem to remember we thought we could do that?
J	conf	yes yes that's right
F	ack	yeah

(Tape 4b, Unit 5)

This has an Inf - ack - confR - conf discourse structure. As the subject is a general description of the brochure there is every reason to think that a briefing is going on. The prime recipient of the information appears to be the designer and Frank appears to be presenting Birmingham information for the benefit of briefing the designer. At this point problems set in. It seems there is no further attested information available at this point that can be continue the briefing unit. The interaction type reverts to a procedural topic type.

F	meta I	so um [3] what what you see here is me just having a stab at how the spreads might work.
	inf	I mean you've heard already Juliana that we need to talk,
J	ack	yes mm mm
F	cont	I know we need to talk a lot about the words but umm [1]
	elDP	and if Bob agrees it seems enough just to talk to take the design discussion
B	DPacc	oh yes yes I
F	reason	We can have a lot of toing and froing [about th
B	inf	yeah] And indeed my comments were not so much about the words so much as the theme
F	ack	yeah
B	cont	which is where I think
F	Upshot	So different theme treated similarly
	conf req	
B	conf	[yeah yeah

(Tape 4b, Unit 5)

This opens with information that could be part of a brief, presenting uncertain information and commenting on that uncertainty much the way Derek did in Briefing 1. However Frank now turns the focus of the interaction away from Juliana and towards Bob, to seek his approval to continue with a certain type of interaction. Instead of presenting information for acknowledgement by the designer, a signal of a briefing, Frank is now seeking agreement to his proposal to continue in a certain way, which is a defining feature of a procedural topic type. Thus we have a hybrid topic type Brief - Procedural which seems to indicate the trouble this briefing is in at this stage. Bob again says he is willing to agree to Frank's proposals and agreement is reached on how to proceed and on the limited nature of Bob's misgivings so far. Following a chat phase Frank returns the talk to business with another clear opening procedural topic.

F	DP	Well if I could go quickly through and pick out what I think will is relevant to the design
J	acc	yeah
D	acc	yeah
F	cont	issues Juliana
J	acc	yes of course

(Tape 4b, Unit 6)

This point has already been agreed. Frank, however, first interrupted the briefing that this kind of boundary exchange sets up. This was then followed by non transactional chat. Frank now, ritualistically, seeks to reopen the briefing. He is attempting to

(Tape 4b, Unit 7)

The change starts with the move to uncertainty about the status of the information that should form the briefing unit. Bob has already questioned the word 'measuring'. This leads Frank to once again seek agreement with his proposal that the interaction should continue in a certain way - a key feature of a procedural topic type. This proposal is responded to by Bob, whereas the opening information was acknowledged by Juliana. This is another signal that the interaction type has changed. At this point the designer suggests an issue for discussion and this becomes the way that this brief is enacted - through discussion, and through decision making. There are few certainties to be passed on here, compared to Briefing 1. What is needed is for relevant issues to be discussed, and as much agreement as possible to be reached. This then functions as briefing information. It might be argued that this is a fruitful method of briefing, in that the designer is aware not just of the current state of thinking on the brochure but also on what issues are sensitive to the key members of the team she is preparing illustrative material for.

C. Other Procedural Topics

From this point on other topic types prevail. At first these are largely decision making topic types, of which more later. There are no more opening procedural topic types. There are, however, two other procedural topics that occur at a later stage of the interaction. The first occurs after a lengthy start again, and once again there are no objections. What follows this is another topic type that opens with briefing characteristics.

F	inf	The cover is quite simple it's the corporate signature it's um illustrative material and it's the slogan
J	ack	mm mm

(Tape 4b, Unit 7)

Frank is providing specific information on how he perceives the cover. This too has some of the qualities of a presentation. It opens with a positive evaluation, the cover is simple. And then it lists key features. The differences are that the illustrative material is yet to be determined; by the outcome of this meeting and the designer's own skills, and that the slogan has already been called into question by Bob, even though Frank had asked for the words to be bypassed. The trouble is that Frank himself seems to have trouble avoiding the words. From here on the activity type again takes on the characteristics of a procedural topic type.

F	cont	Whatever [the slogan is
B	ack	Whatever the slogan is] yeah
F	inf	Whatever the slogan is. It's going to have research in it,
B	ack	yeah
F	inf	and quite likely to have quality in it.
B	ack	yeah yeah
F	inf	It might not have measuring
	elDP	but if you're going to do a visual, leave, I think are we happy for Juliana to use these words for a visual idea
B	DPacc	Oh yeah no problem
J	ack	Right ok

decisioning topic type regarding the front cover of Bob's document.

F	DP	I would advise against at this stage tying [1] anybody's hands, least of all Juliana's in saying [1] there is a rule that on the cover we treat all images as [1] photographs and not as illustrations. [1]
	elab	Erm, we'll give her the task of making sure that they do link
J	ack	mm
F	cont	and they've got to obviously
J	acc	Oh they will link yes
F	DP	But let's not tell her how to do it I would suggest.
J	ag	yes

(Tape 4b, Unit 11)

Here we see Frank again trying to control the nature of the interaction that takes place in this meeting, trying to keep this meeting within the confines of a brief rather than, say, a brain storming session. First, he tries to get an agreement not to discuss the words in this meeting. In other words to keep off issues of high uncertainty regarding information status. Having only had limited success, he is here again trying to control the kind of interaction that takes place. Frank is using his expert knowledge of what constitutes a briefing, and arguably his clients' novice status to control the kind of action that can be achieved here. A briefing is not meant to be a set of directives telling someone what to do. A briefing, at least in this document design process, is a meeting of professional equals where the wishes of one group in terms of aims, uses and feel for this document, are passed on to a design specialist who can then use that information to produce a set of potentially suitable visual approaches that will enhance those aims.

If there is a stage when directives can sometimes occur, then in my data it is in a draft review meeting. Once something has been produced, be it words or visuals, then it becomes possible to say 'change this' or 'remove that'. At a stage where no draft text exists a briefing should perform the function of expanding possibilities, not reducing them. It is this kind of notion that seems to lie behind this procedural directive from Frank. Yes, you can pass on the information that the two documents should link, but it is unhelpful to try and tell the designer her own job and to come up with the ways in which they should link. We see Frank here then in his role as facilitator. It is he who attempts to structure the interaction that takes place. It is also his role to act as a mediator between his novice clients and Juliana, who has worked with him on a number of other projects. Frank may not always be successful at controlling the interaction type but he is the only participant to try.

There is one more procedural topic before the closing units and this functions to bring about briefing activity rather than decision making. Frank as meeting facilitator, takes responsibility for time management.

F	Frame	Well
	inf	we are on a bit of a timetable.
B	apol	Oh sorry

F	inf	Well it's not cos you're going on no no.
	inf	You are but that's another matter. [laugh]
	dirDP	but I reckon about ten minutes or so to rattle through it
B	ack	have we ok
F	ack	yes

(Tape 4b, Unit 20)

It is noticeable that the topics that follow this time constraint are more briefing oriented and more collaborative in nature. From this point on the default topic type has a briefing constituent and issues that involve fundamental disagreement no longer arise. Characteristics of briefing and hybrid briefing - decision making topics will be described and discussed in the next section of this chapter.

D. Closure

The procedural topics following this are closedown topics. Briefing 1 had no clear opening procedural topic, but does have the same kind of close down approach as Briefing 2. This second briefing, as detailed above, has great need of opening procedural topics; not simply to open proceedings, but to bring about a suitable form of interaction activity. The close down topics are handled in a similar way to those in Briefing 1 and need not be detailed here.

The Topic Type Sequence in Briefing 2.

Here is the Topic Type sequence for Briefing 2 plus an indication of who takes the leading, initiating role in each topic.

Table 6.4. The Topic Type Sequence in Briefing 2

1	Procedural	Frank
2	Decision	Bob
3	Procedural	Frank
4	Procedural	Frank
5	Brief- Proc	Frank
CHAT		
6	Procedural	Frank
7	Brief- Proc	Frank
8	Info seek	Juliana
9	Decision	Bob
10	Decision	Bob
11	Procedural	Frank
12	Decision	Bob
13	Decision	Frank
CHAT		
14	Briefing	Frank
15	Decision	Bob
16	Procedural	Frank
17	Decision	Bob
18	Decision	Bob / Derek
19	Decision	Bob
20	Procedural	Frank
21	D.Make- Brief	Bob
22	D.Make- Brief	Bob
23	Briefing	Frank
24	Info seek	Juliana
25	D.Make- Brief	Frank / Bob
26	D.Make- Brief	Frank
27	Info Seek	Juliana
28	Briefing	Frank
29	D.Make- Brief	Bob /Frank
30	D.Make- Brief	Frank
31	Info Seek	Derek
32	Proc Close	Frank
33	Proc Close	Frank
	Farewells	

The above topic sequence is an indication of how differently this briefing unfolds compared to Briefing 1. The first briefing topic proper is no

14. And even then any regular pattern of briefing topics is interrupted by lengthy decision making topics.

The second half of the meeting does revert to a more successful briefing pattern. This can be seen in that briefing topic types do now take place, although the realisation of these topics is quite different to what is found in Briefing 1. It has taken half of the meeting to resolve the issue of the cover, and even then it is not finally resolved. In presentations decision topics have to reach a final decision. That is not the case in briefings, which occur at a much earlier stage of proceedings. Frank would have preferred to have had fewer decision topics. On the other hand, as there was inadequate shared information to pass on to Juliana it was inevitable that even if matters had been smoother, this briefing would have been different to Briefing 1, and would have needed the decision making and `discussion' method as a preamble to or replacement of the inform plus element of the brief as enacted in Briefing 1.

The overall goal in the two briefings is the same; to provide necessary information to the designer. As both briefs fulfil that goal they can be expected to belong to the same genre. The analysis here, from a linguistic perspective, demonstrates the degree to which they do. This is in terms of shared topic types. Additionally, through the discourse analysis, showing the different ways these topics unfold, the extent of the variation between the two activities is foregrounded.

There are local contingent reasons why the path taken to reach the shared goal is different in the two texts. For this reason we must admit that a social activity genre such as a briefing need not be realised by a uniform pattern of text type. This can be the case, as for presentations. It can also be the case that the same text type, decision making for example, can be used to realise different social activities. The briefings analysed here are at a mid way point. Similar social activity is being realised by texts that both share common features and yet contain substantial differences. Just how similar or different these two briefings are textually will be shown by the comparative analysis of their briefing topics, which follows in the next section.

The Briefing Activity in Briefing 2

Briefing activity occurs in briefing topics, of which there are very few in Briefing 2, and in topics which are a hybrid of decision making and briefing. Not only are there fewer briefing topics in Briefing 2 but they are conducted in quite a different way to those in Briefing 1. In this section I will describe the range of interactional patterns that constitute the briefing activity in Briefing 2 and compare them with those in Briefing 1. There is clearly far more similarity between those produced by the pro and the client in Briefing 1 than with any of those produced in Briefing 2. The point here is to show that similar events with similar purposes, and even similar participants, can vary in the way they unfold, and yet still retain recognisable generic functional features. Discourse analysis at the topic type level can highlight these differences and show large scale broad similarities.

Patterns of Interaction in Briefing Exchanges in Briefing 2

The patterns built around an informing move, that I detailed for Briefing 1, are not central to the performing of a brief in Briefing 2. As shown in the previous section, when Frank attempts to use this pattern early on in the meeting, the briefing topic breaks down and reverts into a procedural topic instead. A related key difference between the briefing topics in these two briefings is that much of the talk is between Frank and Bob rather than being directed primarily at Juliana. This talk then either stands unmarked as a brief for Juliana, which can cause uncertainty regarding what is briefing information and what is not, or is reformulated by Frank, redirected at Juliana as a briefing unit.

Use of Upshots and Reformulations

This is one regularly occurring element, at least for a successful brief in briefing 2. The upshot of what Frank and Bob between them establish is then presented or reformulated as a briefing unit for Juliana. We not only see this happen in a number of different briefing topic types but we see problems arise when this is not done. This feature then meets the Margaret Berry criterion, raised in the chapter 3 for showing not only that items x and y co-occur but also what happens differently if x occurs and not y.

In Unit 23 we find a clear example of a brief being made effective by its reformulation as an upshot for Juliana by Frank. Bob positively evaluates Frank's proposal in the document. Frank doesn't need always to verbally present his briefing idea because there is a visual accompanying draft. Once agreement has been established, Frank formulates the information as a brief for Juliana.

B	pos ev	I thought this was alright and I think
F	confR	You're happy with that approach there
B	conf	yeah
F	upshot	So it's the individuals of high distinction and then the groupings of people of distinction.
J	ack	mm hmm
B	ack	yeah
F	upshot	So the first paragraph's got to be something like that.

(Tape 4b, Unit 23)

Noticeably it is Juliana who provides the acknowledgement of this upshot, although previously talk had been directed back and forth between Frank and Bob. She orients to the provision of this information as being for her benefit, as representing a newly established consensus from the Birmingham team doing the brief. So the pattern is that once agreement is reached between Frank and Bob, then this agreement can be presented to Juliana as a briefing unit. There is a sequential patterning of events as follows.

Agreement -- Brief

A Focus on Designer Relevant Issues - Quantity of Text

Frank continues his turn in the above topic by developing another regularly occurring feature of a briefing topic in Briefing 2.

F	DP el	The list of specialist research centres how many do you reckon we'd get to?
B	confR	ummm [1] what else could you add in there Derek there's about another two or three possibly?
D	conf	Well about four I thought with the medical ones as well umm
[1]		
B	DPacc	yeah
D	DP	It's gonna be not more than ten
B	acc	yeah.
F	DP	Let's say ten then

(Tape 4b, Unit 23)

Once the main issue on any page has been agreed, or as in this instance, received positive evaluation, the client talk turns to establishing just how much of what has been agreed will find its way onto the page. In the above example, Frank and Bob try to estimate how many specialist research centres there will be. This clearly is information recipient designed for the designer, although she has not requested it. Her job is to produce a visual approach for these pages. Knowing not just what the text will be, but equally important, how much of it there will be is of key significance for her. This is especially true for a document which, in the opening words of this briefing, Frank describes as follows.

F	inf	All I've said about yours really is that is that we envisage it as heavy on what we're now calling atmospheric pictures, light on text, coffee table, all purpose, all audience general message is we've got high quality research and it's good for you to be associated with us.
	confR	Is that fair enough?
	(Tape 4b,	Unit 1)

The visual element is clearly going to be more important for this document than for Derek's. Whereas much of the brief for his document was concerned with content, use and format, here a regularly answered question within each briefing topic is `how much text will there be?'. Emphasis is less on content and more on the accompanying visuals. We see Juliana also orient to this perspective when Bob is being critical of the words.

J	elDP	Shall we discuss at this point the pictorials on this, in terms of the visual?
B	DPacc	Yes, good point
[1]		
F	reform	The message
J	ack	yeah ..
(Tape 4b, Unit 8)		

It is noticeable that Juliana picks up on the way this briefing might be successful. She isn't asking for particular information as she did of Derek regarding the content of his brochure, instead she asks for `discussion' of the visuals issue. Again this highlights the unpreparedness of the Birmingham team to deliver this brief, information must be discussed, not merely delivered. It also indicates that the discussion method used here is not perceived as being unusual. Juliana seems to accept the situation as normal. In terms of end result, what matters is that some agreement can be reached so that enough information can be passed on for Juliana to feel briefed and so enabled to perform her design function. In Briefing 2 that information needs to be established, or at least the information in the draft document has to be accepted and evaluated by the client, before it can count as briefing information. In Briefing 1 the status of the information was either tacitly taken for granted or referred to by Derek in a way that usually showed that he thought he had grounds to believe that what he was saying would be agreed to by Frank.

Key Briefing Elements in Briefing 2

To return to topic 23, if this is seen as a smooth running example of a brief in Briefing 2 then the key elements responsible for its success would appear to be;

Section A

1. Client Positive Evaluation of existing text.
2. Upshot of the discussion between Frank and Bob reformulated as a brief by Frank for Juliana.

Section B

1. Agreement from the Birmingham team on the numbers of the item in question.
2. Presentation of this information for the designer.

This is the successful sequential pattern of interaction in Unit 23. When elements are missing we can see the briefing become more problematic. This occurs in Unit 25, closely following on from 23. This is a hybrid briefing - decision topic, in that there is an agreed problem to which a solution is looked for collectively and broadly within the existing framework for the page that exists in Frank's first draft document.

The discussion of this page takes a problem - solution format. This is how it opens, with negative evaluation signalling the existence of a problem with the page.

F	focus	mm eight and nine
B	neg ev	This one worried me.
F	cue	That's over to you Bob.
B	confR	This is the history page as I call it isn't it?
F	conf	Yeah

(Tape 4b, Unit 25)

Frank opens talk on this page of the brochure with a focus move. Bob does not positively evaluate what he sees, as in the previous topic. Frank then cues Bob to expand on his negative evaluation, to present the problem to the group, even though this is clearly shared information between Frank and Bob. Bob sets the scene for Frank to take an extended turn to narrate the problematic history of this page. Both men orient their talk to the shared nature of the anecdotal information they are going to produce.

B	inf	Frank'll tell you when we've played this game before
F	laugh	

B	cont	=we've then struggled.
F	ack	There aren't any
B	meta I	Another way of putting this page is
	reform	What has been achieved that effects everyday life
	comment	which is another one Frank's tried.

(Tape 4b, Unit 25)

Between them Frank and Bob construct the narrative that functions to explain the problem.

F	inf	I wrote to every head of school
B	o comp	saying what have you done
F	cont	[What have you done
B	cont	That's materially] effected the lives
F	cont	in the life of your school
D	ack	yes
F	cont	=which had it not been done the every day life of the people of this county would have been changed. [1]
	reason	It was started off by the vc referring to the microwave,
	confR	you know the
D	conf	yeah
F	cont	There's one, find out what else there is.
	result	I didn't get any replies
J	newsM	mm?
F	cont	At all.

(Tape 4b, Unit 25)

Juliana receives the story as newsworthy. No sooner is it told than reasons for this problem are suggested. This is why the story is told. It is not just conversationally newsworthy, it explains where the problem lies with this page, what it is about the culture of Birmingham University that makes it difficult to get hold of this kind of information.

D	ack	Modesty forbids.
B	rej	No I don't think it's that,
	rej	And I don't think it's the problem

		that the er there aren't any.
	reason	[I think it's the scientific culture
D	elab	No People don't recognise They don't look at it they don't look at it in that way]
B	cont	Can't think in those terms
F	acc	That's right
D	acc	That's that's it

(Tape 4b, Unit 25)

This unit has developed in this way due to the client's opening negative rather than positive evaluation. The narrative following the negative evaluation has highlighted where the problem with this page lies.

Having agreed what the problem is, and yet still wanting a history page in this document, the client talk progresses as follows.

B	ack	Alright then Derek.
	meta I	The sixty four dollar question,
	DP el	How then do we find out that information?
F	laugh	
B	comment	You can't ask them
D	DP	Somebody sits down and drafts it and circulates it
B	DP el	But could you do that?
D	DP	I'd have a shot in my own area.
B	DP el	Yeah well how would you get the other areas then
D	rep	Don't know . .

(Tape 4b, Unit 25)

Bob's question, `how do we find out that information', is a request for a solution, which Derek personally offers to provide. Frank soon provides an upshot of the situation as it has developed, and offers advance positive evaluation of the page if it can be done. This is not an upshot that reformulates the talk as a briefing unit for Juliana. This records the outcome of the previous talk, the decision that the Birmingham team have taken. This shows that far from being ready to brief Juliana with information in this meeting, the Birmingham team have not yet even decided among themselves whether to do certain pages or how to do them.

F	DP upshot	So we're going for it.
	pos ev	Be wonderful thing to have.
B	elab	Well we'd never have to produce it again if we had it.
F	ack	yeah
B	cont	Be worth doing it just for that.
J	ack	mmm

(Tape 4b, Unit 25)

Although Juliana gives some acknowledgment here, the upshot is not particularly directed at her. There is no `well for you Juliana something like that'. What we have here is the Birmingham team agreeing a course of action. Of course, it is relevant to Juliana and being present at this talk is, in a sense, to be in receipt of information, but this does not appear to be necessarily sufficient. This topic ends with talk between Bob and Derek on the ways and means of going about this task. Nothing more is said on the matter to Juliana.

Another hybrid briefing topic passes and then there is an information seek topic initiated by Juliana.

J	per req	I in fact if I could just go back quickly to pages eight and nine
	clfyR	where we have impressive list of events and people ancient and modern um is that still in
F+B	clfy	yeah it's still in
J	confR	we still think there's going to be some

B	conf	Down to Derek that (laugh)
F	inf	It's our top, well, knowing how hard it is it's our top twelve.
J	clfyR	And do you really see that just as a listing or do you see it the odd few photographs in there?
B	clfyR	Which one we on here eight and nine?
F	clfy	yeah
B	confR	This is what I call the history page.
F	DP el	Will we get to twelve
B	clfy	Yeah I think you should have some pictures of [people like er
F	cont	twelve world]
B	rep	Howarth, Nobel Laureate
F	ack	[yeah
B	cont	and]so forth
J	ack	yes
B	pos ev	I mean that would be an easy way of doing it.
F	ack	yeah
F	inf	It's a history page
J	ack	yeah
B	dir	But what you mustn't run away with on that page as you rightly said, is it becomes too historical.
J	ack	mmm
F	osupp	There's got to be [some last year
B	elab	There's got to be] contin-,
	ack	yeah [exactly
J	ack	Oh yes] yeah
F	ack	yeah
B	fg	otherwise
F	Upshot	So it's people of products people and products related to the [top twelve
J	ack	yeah]
B	Ev	It's a tough one that
	comment	you'll have fun with that.
J	ack	yes
	pos ev	that's fine
F	ack	yeah

(Tape 4c, Unit 27)

Juliana needs to go back to the history page. Clearly then, not enough has been said for her to feel adequately briefed on this spread. All the Birmingham team have done is to decide to do it. No briefing information on this page has been provided at all. There has ben no upshot or reformulation of the information specifically provided for the designer. The Birmingham team are doing pre briefing work and are not clearly passing on the results of their decision making to Juliana. Juliana isn't sure if the page is still in, given the uncertainty surrounding its content and the problems it has caused before. Having checked that the page is still in, she then asks the next most relevant question for her, on an issue on which she has received no information from her clients so far, the visuals for this page. Again we see visuals as a priority for the designer on this document, an issue that she will seek information on if it is not provided in the course of the brief.

Information elements present in successful briefing Units such as 23 are missing from Unit 25 and Juliana's request for those items of information give a clear indication of what briefing requirements in a briefing discussion are. Now we see information from both Bob and Frank directed at and receiving acknowledgement from Juliana. This is then followed by an upshot formulation from Frank, again directed at the designer, to capture what he thinks is relevant for her in what has been said on this spread. So, having signalled the inadequacy of her brief, information is directed at her and an upshot is produced to terminate the topic. The situation is remedied by focussing attention on visuals, directing talk at the designer and formulating an upshot for her. These seem to be successful strategies for attesting the status of decision making talk between the Birmingham team as briefing units for the designer.

Topic Type Categorisation in Briefing 2

Unit 23 is categorised as a briefing topic in that the information in Frank's first draft document is not disputed at all by Bob. The decision making topics between Units 2 and 19 are categorised as such in that they deal with attempts by the client to fundamentally change the information that is contained in this draft document. The hybrid decision making - briefing topics are so categorised because although they work within the constraints of the draft document page in question, they do look to solve problems or to further specify its content. It is on these grounds, as the table below indicates, that the grouping of the topic types is justified. Below is an overview of the way that the topic types have been categorised.

Table 6.5. Briefing and Decision Based Topic Types in Briefing 2

Briefing Topics

14.	Frank's view of the page is presented unopposed
23.	Bob gives positive evaluation to what he sees on the page and this can then be presented to the designer
28.	An uncontested review of a spread by Frank for Juliana's benefit

Decision Topics

2. Bob's negative evaluation of the cover

9-13. Bob's desire to specify what should appear on the cover of the two documents

15-19. Bob and Derek's desire to change the way faculties and schools are represented in the document

Hybrid Decision - Briefing Topics

21. Bob specifies what the brochure text, facilities and equipment should mean in terms of visuals

22. Bob suggests a change in page ordering without a change in page content

25. The concept of a history page is uncontested. Bob looks for a way to realise it

26. Bob specifies suitable visuals for the page concept and raises a potential problem with his decision proposal

29. Following positive evaluation for the page from Bob, frank raises a problem with the visuals for it.

30. Frank again raises the problem of visuals for a page that is otherwise uncontested.

Briefing - Decisioning Hybrid Topics

The main difference between these hybrid topics and decisioning topics is to be found in their brevity and smooth running. Unit 26 opens with a page shift move from Frank, facilitating quick progress at this stage of the meeting.

F	Proc dir	Well I'm going to drive you on
B	Pos ev	Well it's easy now
	reason	because I think it gets easier the further down the lot we go
F	ack	ok

(Tape 4c, Unit 26)

Then Bob offers positive evaluation of this draft page. Again there is no need for a verbal brief, an inform plus unit, when there is a draft text in front of the participants. Bob continues by offering ideas for the kind of visuals that would suit this. This shows his orientation to the briefing requirements of both designer and pro.

B	pos ev	This one is no problem at all.
	inf	This is our blue chip companies who support us
	DP	and the more endorsements we can get on there or the more other company logos or the more pictures about
F	Upshot	Fill it with names and logos something like that

(Tape 4c, Unit 26)

Frank provides what looks like an Upshot of the decision being taken by the client team for Juliana. However Bob raises a possible difficulty with this decision. Now Juliana offers her professional experience to reject Bob's problem. When the issue at stake is not an internal one for the client team, and is additionally on a subject familiar to the designer, then she can contribute to the decision making element of the briefing discussion along with her Birmingham clients.

B	pos ev	I like names and logos
	qual	but some of them are a bit sniffy about being able to use their logos that's the problem
F	fg	But [that, yeah
J	rej	Depends on the relationship] with the company.
	elab	Normally I've found that erm I mean I don't know how it operates in your field but if ever we need to use logos we write to the company concerned and state what it's to be used for and as long as they're asked they normally
B	clfyR	They won't charge an enormous royalty.
D	clfy	They don't charge for
J	clfy	Oh no they don't, most don't charge at all.

(Tape 4c, Unit 26)

Then we see talk between Frank and Bob aimed at fine tuning this agreement. The cooperative nature of the talk is signalled by the acceptance of proposals and by the advancing of proposals that build on the proposals of the other.

F	DP	Well as long as we don't give the impression there's a logo from every company that's listed just a [few
B	acc	No it] has to be a scattering.
F	elab	A few Rolls Royces yeah
B	DP	We could certainly for example try and get a logo for every one of our named chairs,
F	ack	yeah
B	pos ev	That would be a good start
F	ack	yeah yeah
J	ack	mm hmm
B	cont	No, That wouldn't be too many either

(Tape 4c, Unit 26)

This is as smooth as this meeting has run so far. When the decision topics are dealt with, in the following chapter, it will become clear how problematical progress has been. The sequential interaction is similar to that which leads to a successful briefing unit in topic 23.

Section A

1. Client Positive Evaluation of existing text.
2. Upshot of the discussion between Frank and Bob reformulated as a brief by Frank for Juliana.

Section B

1. Agreement from the Birmingham team on the numbers of the item in question.
2. Presentation of this information for the designer.

The only complication, leading to the categorising of this talk as a hybrid briefing topic, is Bob's raising of a problem with using logos at a point between sections A and B. Once that has been resolved by Juliana's experience of using logos we see, in the piece of talk quoted above, that the client talk orients to matters that belong in Section B part 1. Bob's comparative novice status and Frank's as expert are displayed by what happens next.

Bob seems to want to run on while things are going smoothly but Frank realises that some attention needs to be paid to the designer's needs; section B part 2 information.

B	fg	And I think what you've got here is actually is the
F	clfyR	Which are you on are you on to twelve and thirteen?
B	clfy	yeah yeah
F	proc DP	cos, can I just go back to ten and eleven?
B	apol	sorry

(Tape 4c, Unit 26)

The cooperative nature of the talk at the moment is also signalled by Bob's apology. Frank exercises his right to control the pace of the meeting in order to complete Section B part 2 and present numbers information to Juliana.

F	DP el	About how many names might we be thinking of.
	DP	Two hundred?
B	rej	Oh no no er.
	DP	thirty to fifty.
F	newsM	Oh really
J	ack	mm
F	fg	so we're going to need
B	elab	My list without much effort has got about twenty, twenty five [names on
F	ack	right.]
J	ack	mm hmm

(Tape 4c, Unit 26)

Frank brings the talk down to quantities and request the necessary information from Bob, who as head of industrial liaison can be regarded as, and is assumed to be by Frank, primary knower on this issue. Frank even produces a fragment of the upshot move that we see Frank use to present the results of client talk as having the status of briefing information for the designer. However, he is interrupted by Bob, who provides the same information and he receives acknowledgement from both Frank and Juliana and the briefing unit is successfully completed.

The hybrid briefing unit for pages twelve and thirteen, (Unit 29) offers a variation on the sequential patterning described above. It opens with Frank focusing attention on the next spread and Bob cooperatively showing his orientation to this spread.

F	focus	Twelve and thirteen erm
B	clfyR	This is the page about us as it were.
F	clfy	yeah.

(Tape 4c, Unit 29)

This is then followed by the statement of a problem by Frank that is to do with the visual for this page and a possible solution to that problem. This solution is negatively evaluated by Bob.

F	problem	I don't know how we'll illustrate this,
	DP	team photo?
B	rej	No I tried a team photo, I didn't like that.
	reason	We did that in Europe and it didn't we were all too self conscious.
F	ack	yeah yeah
B	cont	A bit gumbyish

(Tape 4c, Unit 29)

Talk is not about the words in the draft document which led to the early problems in this meeting but focuses on the key visual issue. This decision making element of this topic opens with the recognition of a problem with the spread and then looks for decision proposals to solve that problem. This initial proposal is rejected by Bob. Frank then makes a second proposal that is positively received by both Juliana and Bob.

F	altDP	We might have you in a meeting with some real people, we might photograph you in a real conference.
J	pos ev	Oh that's always reassuring
B	pos ev	yes, That's a better idea

(Tape 4c, Unit 29)

This is an example of briefing being carried out collaboratively through discussion that unfolds as decision making. There is an overall briefing social activity going on, which can be enacted by briefing topic types, by decision making topic types and by a hybrid of the two. Here, Frank's first decision proposal, his first offer of a solution to the problem of illustrating this page is negatively evaluated by Bob. We have a discourse pattern for this interaction as follows.

Achieve joint focus on spread -- state problem -- DP -- neg ev - alt DP - acc.

There is no upshot from Frank; Juliana's own positive evaluation of Frank's proposal arguably removes the requirement. The lack of conflict on this page is signalled also by the use of humour at the close of the topic.

F	cont	Here's Doctor Bushaway missing another [opportunity
B	ack	That's right] yes [laugh.]
	elab	Safe pair of hands, whoops he's dropped another
F	elab	The meeting that could have been [so important

(Tape 4c, Unit 29)

The humour is on the agreed solution to the visual problem for this page. I think the use of humour indicates that agreement has been reached, that no more serious discussion of this topic is necessary. Bob does however raise one more issue that can count as a briefing unit for Juliana.

B	DP	For me,] to me the key thing there is that the contact's name, number, address, what ever it's going to be, is as clean and as bold and as clear as possible.
D	o supp	The same goes for [our document
J	clfyR	When you] when you say contact
B	clfy	Well this further information
J	DP acc	yes it would appear there
F	account	Yeah I left it on cos I didn't know whether it was one or all your team or more than that.
B	ack	yeah
	restate	But that's I mean if anybody does anything having got this document about saying I know about the university of Birmingham, I want to find out more. It's this page that has to tell 'em how to get
J	acc	right sure
F	o comp	tell em how to find it yeah
J	acc	yeah mm hmm

(Tape 4c, Unit 29)

Bob raises a key issue for him, not visual, but pertinent to the design of this spread. It must provide a clear means of contact. Bob's main sphere of interest is in representing the faculties' interests. When Bob initiates a briefing unit, such as this one, it concerns practicalities like making contact. These are the kind of issues that if handled wrongly would bring flak to Bob, much more so than choice of picture. It is clear that this is a briefing unit in that it is Juliana who responds to Bob and Derek's decision proposal. First she seeks clarification of the issue and then assures Bob that this information will be clearly available. As Bob is the client and the budget holder for this brochure this last unit is similar in nature to briefing activity in Briefing 1. The content is assured. Bob is adding one `key thing' that must be on this page. There is no need to negotiate such issues.

The next and final hybrid briefing topic again opens with a positive evaluation from Bob. This signals that there are no major problem with this page from the client point of view. This means the activity won't unfold as a decision making topic, such as we will see in the next section and that it will either be a briefing topic or a hybrid briefing topic.

F	fg	So
B	pos ev	And then the corporate bit at the end which is great.
F	ack	Yeah,

(Tape 4c, Unit 29-30)

Frank again raises the problem of illustration. This means there is a need for a decision proposal and some agreement; thus the topic is a hybrid one.

F	Neg ev	illustrating your page is not so easy
B	fg	Well no I think I mean I think you [could
F	el	How long's the list
B	DP	It could no no] I would I would illustrate my page by trying to illustrate some of the things that you've listed in the top half
F	clfyR	Contract research
B	DP elab	In other words we'll show them a teaching company meeting going on in

GEC with a teaching company associate
[explaining the project
F DP ack ok]
(Tape 4c, Unit 30)

This time the proposed solution comes from Bob. He clarifies his position and receives some positive token of acceptance from the pro. Again the discourse pattern here is

Pos ev - Raise problem - DP + elaborate - ack

Conclusion

The sequential patterns discussed above can be found regularly in decision making topics, whether in briefings or other social activities. They are unavailable as a strategy in a briefing such as Briefing 1 because the information there is largely already agreed and not in need of negotiation. In Briefing 2, where a discussion method is inevitable, then a decision making enactment is one available way of doing the briefing. The sequential patterns described for Briefing 2 are all very different from those described to account for the social activity in Briefing 1. Nevertheless one can see that the outcome is the same. The designer has received what she regards as enough information to progress the document design process to her and her clients' satisfaction. The difference in the interaction stems largely from the different starting points the two briefings worked from. The claim that both belong to the same genre is based on the shared purpose both meetings have, the shared goal they both reach and the topic types they share. Some genres, research article introductions and service encounters will, to a large extent, share common opening and closing positions. This is unlikely to be the case for professional communicative activity. Different parts of the process can occur at different speeds and involve different participants. Especially in informal environments, which appear from my data to be the norm for document design, communicative practices will be shaped to fit the local requirements.

A genre analysis of such interaction needs to be flexible enough to recognise that there are similarities in social activity occurrences and what these similarities are. It needs to recognise a common purpose to these occurrences even when they do not unfold in the same sequential manner. A discourse analytic approach pitched at the level of topic type provides a means of showing both generic features and important differences between these professional communication episodes.

1. See the Communicative Event descriptions for Tape 4 in the Userguide for a breakdown of features for these two briefings.

2. This may be acknowledgement, agreement, or acceptance.

3. See Chapter 8 on Rhetorical Structure for more detail.

4. See Sacks Schegloff and Jefferson (1977) on basic turn taking patterns in interaction.

CHAPTER 7

DECISION MAKING IN THE DOCUMENT DESIGN PROCESS

7.1 Introduction

Decision Making and Small Group Analysis have been key concerns for Social Psychology and social psychological approaches to organisational communication until recently when, as documented in chapter 4, there has been a sea change in organisational communication. A move away from looking for macro scale similarities, generalised patterns of decision making, and from using experimental laboratory conditions to understand group interaction towards a contextually based study of group interaction using micro analytical techniques to reveal small scale differences between groups.

There has been some linguistic work in the Eighties on decision processes and the making of proposals, notably that of Jackson & Jacobs (1981), Houtkoop (1987), Firth (1991) and Denise Murray (1987). The first two works cited have documented linguistic elements of the proposal - acceptance or rejection cycle of activity. Both have used speech act and pragmatic analysis to provide a description of the activity they describe. The patterns they discover, (especially those of Jackson and Jacobs 1981, p.80) bear a close resemblance to the basic model of decision making text that is to be found in this thesis. A limitation of this work, or at least a major difference between it and my own, is that their research sites are non organisational. Furthermore they are non specific other than being conversational, and then either face to face or by phone. They are looking for general microanalytical features of decision making and not to describe those features according to how they vary from one specific context to the next.

Firth's work is grounded steeply in Conversation Analysis. It does, however, take an institutional context for its data and provide a very detailed analysis of negotiation activity in English between non native speakers in different countries communicating via fax and phone. The data is all from one company and is restricted to 900 lines of talk. The consequences of this are that the analysis is of a micro, micro level, more detailed than is attempted by this thesis, but not shown as generalisable beyond the practices of one Danish dairy.

Murray's work deals with negotiation at the work place from a discourse analytic plus speech act perspective, using a coding scheme for her data and a network system (see Murray 1987, p.63) that shows the dynamic unfolding nature of action oriented activity in the work place. The focus of her work, however, is different from my own, dealing with the mode of production of request based activities in the office. She explores the consequences of using e-mail and other computer mediated communication systems as the medium for negotiation. Her work, then, does show differences in routes taken through negotiation sequences, as the following chapter will show different possible routes through decision making activities according to the different social events it forms a part of. Her focus, however, is not on genre, on the types of social activity that can be differentiated according to the kind of route that they prefer, but on differences due to mode. This chapter will explore decision making activity within one professional activity, that of document design, as enacted in the related professional fields of public relations and technical writing. It will attempt to establish generic features that demarcate one stage of this business activity from another.

Draft Review and Briefing Activity

The draft review meeting, Tape 1, shares similar decision making practices with Briefing 2. The social activity in the two meetings, however, is different. Information is shared and negotiated between client and pro for the purpose of improving a draft, not of writing a first copy. Of course there is some possible overlap with a briefing, as we shall see with the technical writing data in Part 2 of this thesis. Informing someone how to write a first draft of a text, and then revising that first draft into improved versions are clearly not unrelated. What this chapter seeks to do is show that while the decision making activity in both meetings is very similar, and can be said to evince a decision making text type, the social activities of the two meetings are different. This will be demonstrated in terms of the different purpose the decision making is put to in the activity, its different sequential location, and also through the use of flow charts that will account for the choices taken by participants within decision making sequences and show that the range of alternatives for one social activity are different to those for the other.

7.2 Tape 1. The Draft Review Activity

The speech event of this meeting is a draft review. The pro is writing the text for a brochure on process engineering. She is still learning to write as though she were competent in the professional field of process engineering. It is not surprising that there are some errors. This talk is for the specific purpose of improving the current text; the very activity that the pro in Briefing 2 in Tape 4B did procedural work to avoid.

We find the client instructing the pro how to write the text. This is a kind of interaction that is not part of the process for the Birmingham group. As the last chapter concluded, document design will take on different shapes in different organisations. Even meetings that can be assigned to the same genre because they share the same goal might well have different starting points from which that goal is reached. For the Birmingham group, the pro knows enough about work at Birmingham, being an employee, not to need a briefing from another member of staff. For the brochure, discussed in Briefing 1, where lack of technical knowledge might have been a pro problem, he has farmed the writing of the technical text out to the biotechnology staff.

In Tape 1, however, the pro works for a consultancy. The path taken to document design is to inform the pro on process engineering and let her use her writing skills as a pro to draft the brochure text. Then the technical staff correct the draft. The meeting proceeds with issues in the draft text gone through in order, page by page. The initiative on most points is taken by the client. This means that, to a large extent, it is he who points out the cause of the negative evaluation of the current draft and he who offers the decision proposal (DP) for its correction.[1]

A basic generic structure for this interaction, then, is

Neg Ev + DP ----- acc

There are many examples of this simple pattern occurring in Tape 1, unlike in Briefing 2 where such a basic pattern for decision making is potentially available, but rarely occurs without some complication. This is because the participants orient to the central need for decision making in Tape 1; it is the prime means for getting the job of the draft review done. As we have seen for the briefings however, decision making is not the prime means for getting the job done; it is a contingent complication to the basic activity of doing a briefing.

The discourse analysis reveals a large number of Decision Proposals (DPs) in Tape 1, most of which are negotiated quickly, and nearly all of which relate directly to existing text on the page. Tape 1 provides the best chance of recognising regular generic and context sensitive paths through decision making in a clearly defined stage of the document design process, a draft review. The unfolding nature of the social interaction is analysable in the following interconnected ways.

1 How the decision making sequences unfold and are accomplished.

2. Where such sequences fit in the larger pattern of the interaction.

3. What the key variables are in the range of available decision making sequences as they occur in the draft review and briefing 2.

First, a set of patterns for decision making in Tape 1 will be presented and then comparisons drawn with decision making in Briefing 2.

Types of Decision Making in Tape 1

Viewed linguistically, decision making sequences can be divided as follows.

1. Those Units initiated by cl

2. Those Units initiated by pro

Sequencing

For the most part, sequencing of the decision making process is a straightforward and repeated pattern of events. There are three ways in which decision making processes are initiated in the data and this will serve as a starting point for looking at the range of patterns.

These are

1. Opening with client negative evaluation of existing text.
2. Opening with a decision proposal from the client
3. Opening made by the pro.

The frequency of occurrence is as follows.

Table 7.1. Frequency of Decision Making Patterns in Tape 1.

Type	Units	Total
Type 1.	Units 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21	10
Type 2.	Units 2, 5, 7, 11, 16, 18, 22, 24.	8

Type 3 Units 1, 3, 6, 23, 25, 26. 6

The table above shows that in Tape 1, 24 of the first 26 topics are decision making ones. The remaining two are both common ground topics, where the participants orient to being on the same wavelength as each other. Pro initiated DPs, occur more commonly at the beginning and end of the process. This leaves the bulk of the decisions to be initiated by the client using either type 1 or 2 above. Most of these DPs are text oriented. The situation was both pro and client poring over the latest pro draft of the text, which by then had comments written over it, largely by the client. What happens in the meeting is an explanation of those comments, formulated either as negative evaluation of the original text plus a proposal for how to improve it or just as a DP to improve the next draft.

1. Opening with a Client Negative Evaluation

Upto the Decision Proposal

The commonest pattern of achieving a decision to change the document in the next draft is as follows. Optionally, the client reads the offending text out loud. This is then followed by his negative evaluation. This is the first obligatory element if this type of decision making sequence is followed. The discourse pattern so far then reads;

[read] - Neg ev.

It is at this point that a range of options may occur.

At its simplest we find

[read] - neg ev - DP - acc

The negative evaluation leads to a DP. This is almost a certainty, a clear pattern for the interactive accomplishment of decision making. The alternatives are either a DP from the client or else from the pro. At its simplest, with least work to be done, the DP comes from the client. Here are a couple of near identical examples to show the pattern of interaction that is economically kept to by the professional participants.

Cl	read	In house mechanical and process control capabilities..
	neg ev	umm didn't like mean that
Pro	clfyR	sorry
Cl	clfy	didn't quite mean that very much.
	alt DP	I thought they enabled focus technology to see a project right through to completion
Pro	ack	ok
Cl	cont	instead of meaning that focus technology is able to [see a project
Pro	ack	[right]

(Tape 1, Unit 13)

Here we see the basic pattern outlined above, complicated only by a brief clarification sequence initiated by the pro. She accepts the negative evaluation silently, and audibly accepts his suggested change to the text.

Here is a similar example.

Cl	neg ev	Yeah, You had a can in there. I don't like cans, . . much.
	DP	Focus Technology's multi disciplinary team is working together comma iron out problems along the way. We do it
	reason	'can' suggests we can do it but we don't always bother.
	chk	ok?
Pro	ack	mm hmm

(Tape 1, Unit 15)

Here the option to read the offending text is not taken up. The client opens with negative evaluation of the pro's wording of the document. This is received silently, and then the client follows this up with a DP on how to improve the text. He then offers a reason why his version is better. This can be seen as another optional element. It occurs here, after the DP has been made, but its positioning is not definable in terms of generic structure.

A variation on this, a complication as opposed to the clarificatory repair work as in Unit 13 above, occurs when for example the pro adds a complimentary DP to that of the client. As in Unit 9.

Cl	read	and provide cost effective and innovative solutions
Pro	ack	mmm . . .
CL	Neg ev	I was a bit iffy about the actual

		ordering of this paragraph.
	DP	I thought maybe that our sort of mission statement ought to be
Pro	O Comp	higher [up
Cl	cont	higher up the batting order umm with this coming on the end and actually providing some substance to it
Pro	DP	well maybe that ought to go at the top
Cl	ack	yeah
Pro	cont	maybe that ought to [go there
Cl	acc	[yeah} I wouldn't disagree with that
Pro	cont	And then you go into [bla bla bla bla bla
Cl	ack	[yeah}
Pro	cont	And then you know engineering staff (reading inaudibly)

(Tape 1, Unit 9)

The discourse pattern here reads as follows.

[rd] + neg ev + DP ----pro supp DP -- acc - supp DP elab --acc

This Unit is indicative of the close collaborative relationship that holds between these participants. The outcome of the decisioning is collaboratively achieved; the pro offers a decision proposal that builds on the client's. This is collaborative decision making rather than confrontational.

The other option in a decision making sequence opening with client negative evaluation is for the pro to produce a DP before the client does. Clearly however, what must be produced by one or other participant, once a negative evaluation of current text has been made, is a proposal on how to improve it. This counts as a generic element of draft checking. In a briefing, negative evaluation can be met with acknowledgement and uncertainty on how to proceed, options that are unavailable in a late stage draft review meeting.

This gives a generic structure potential (GSP) for draft review decision making opening with a negative evaluation as follows.

```
[rd] -- neg ev [+/- support / reasons ] ---DP (cl)
                                        ---DP (pro)
```

After the Decision Proposal

A range of choices is available after a pro DP. The simplest occurrence in the data is an accept move which will function to close the current decision making Unit down. Units 9, 15 and 13, described above, all continue in this way after the DP. Other available and more complicating responses are described below. In Unit 8 we find the client rejecting the pro's DP produced in response to his negative evaluation of her text.

Cl	Neg Ev	Highly trained engineer I didn't like computer staff over much
	reason	sounds like data process operators or something
Pro	altDP	What systems staff?
Cl	rej	Well yeah but then we're going to end up with systems everywhere at this rate
Pro	el	What else would you call them?

	alt DP	software programmers
Cl	rej	but then you get engineering staff and software programmers then [er
Pro	altDP	mmm] well you don't really need to put it in at all actually. You could just have our highly trained staff.. team [our highly trained teams
Cl	DP	[professional staff] and then [you'll find
Pro		[inaudible}
Cl	inf	I've put that in down here as well so that I [think about that
Pro	ack	[right ok]

(Tape 1, Unit 8)

Here the pro produces the first DP of the sequence in response to the client's neg ev, giving the following sequence;

Neg ev - pro DP

This is rejected by the client. It is done by expressing the hypothetical result of putting the pro's DP into practice (but then x), where x is clearly negatively evaluated by the client. This is shown by the pro's response to it which is to offer a different, an alternative DP, (an alt DP).

Thus we have an enactment sequence that runs

Neg ev --[pro DP -rej] *
(where * = repeatable)

In Unit 8 the sequence ends when the client produces his own DP, which the pro accepts. The final accept is the obligatory feature; what must occur if the

Unit is to complete. That the decisioning goes in favour of the client is the common outcome in this meeting. This gives a complete decision making sequence as follows;

Neg ev --[pr DP -rej] * - cl DP - acc

The data make the client's role appear to be + power, but even if this is true, it is due to the stage of proceedings and the way this particular document design task is broken up into stages. In the previous stage it is arguable that the pro was in a position of power as she produced a draft text. The client's power here is not to rewrite, although he could call for such a thing, but to negotiate changes. This is an agreed sharing of labour based on the distribution of skills between the client and the pro.

We find the client making negative evaluation of the text on a number of grounds. Some of these reflect the client's technical knowledge, for example in Unit 20, regarding 'anti pollution equipment'. As a scientist, he recognises language from the wrong register, and that it will be recognised as such by the scientific reader this document is aimed at. Similarly to the client in the Birmingham data, we see the client here worries at the way the text presents his company; the people he is client for. Here that long term role concern shows itself as questioning what such terms as 'highly trained engineer' suggest.

A far larger amount of the negative evaluation than one might have expected is actually aimed at the English used by the pro. This range of negative evaluation topics indicates again that roles can be shared in this process, and that what might be considered a pro area of expertise need not stay so. Through experience the client learns what is effective in prose just as the pro learns about process engineering and can on occasion defend her use of terminology.

The last example showed the client rejecting the pro's alt DPs for improving the text. An alternative development is for the pro to support her criticised text. She briefly does this in Unit 20.

Cl	negev	or 'install new anti pollution equipment' is a bit sort of Daily Mirror
Pro	S supp	well I wanted a kind of catch all for kind of you know
Cl	ack	yeah
	DP	well, pollution control [equipment
Pro	ack	alright]
Cl	neg ev	Anti pollution doesn't really mean anything ...

(Tape 1, Unit 20)

The interactive sequence here then is
[read] - neg ev - pr self supp - cl alt Dp - acc

Once again the outcome supports the client's position. Both parties orient to as speedy a reconciliation of each raised issue as possible in this meeting. This is probably due to the near final stage of this document design process. In Briefing 2 issues are being aired for the first time. This means there is less apparent motivation for the parties to reach a speedy resolution. As will be seen when we compare the decision making in that meeting, there is a difference also in the nature of the resolutions that are acceptable closing points for the decision making sequences. Firm and final decisions are called for here that will have concrete repercussions for the next text draft; this is far from the case ion briefing 2.

2. Decision Units Initiated by a Client DP

Decision Sequences open with a DP when the intent is to put something into the text or move something in the text, rather than to focus on a fault with the current draft.

1. DP + Support

The basic pattern is for the client to produce his DP and then to add some support to it, as in the following example.

Cl	DP	I thought it was about time we introduced quality into the equation somewhere along the line about this point here.
	reason	We don't seem to have it up front at all.
	reason+pos ev	Definitely the buzz word of the nineties at the moment
Pro	clfyR	quality
Cl	cont +clfy	outside of research where it's synergy, yeah.
	reason	Quality I think is high on the customer's shopping list isn't

it.

(Tape 1, Unit 7)

The DP opens the sequence and its function is to introduce a key word, quality. There is no negative evaluation of existing text, other than by implication that this word has been left out. The DP is supported by reasons and evaluation. The first supporting reason (we don't seem to have it) carries the implied negative evaluation of the existing text. The second one is positive evaluation for the term itself, as is the third reason. Again we see the client concern for buzz words that will appeal to his market and he corrects the pro text on this basis. The pro only produces a confirmation request to check that it is the word 'quality' that the client is arguing for. This receipt marker of the term accompanied by no other move from her on this issue indicates I think collaborative acceptance of the client's proposal.

The discourse patterning for this Unit can be shown like this.

DP + reason (neg ev) + reason (pos ev) - conf req - conf + reason (pos ev)

The necessary features being DP + support - receipt

Unit 2 provides a very similar example. Again we find the initial DP accompanied by a number of reasons why it should be accepted.[2]

DP + reason + result +++ DP2 + reason - pro confR - conf - acc - alt DP - acc

In this Unit there are a number of linked DPs. The first is a general one to move some text. This is accompanied by a Support unit that is composed of a reason and a result. The reason for changing the text, what it will achieve and the resulting form of the new text. This is then followed by a second related DP. It isn't to put something into the text but to take something out. This too comes with a supporting reason. There is a third DP at the end of this Unit which is an alternative DP (alt DP) to the second.

The pro's response to these interrelated DPs is first, as in Unit 7, to produce an upshot confirmation request to check that she knows what she is meant to do as a result. The Client confirms using a reason - result structure. The only other pro moves in this Unit are accepts. Units 11 and 18 provide similar easy decision making process examples.

2. More Complicated Patterns

There are other Units that open with an initial client DP sequences that are not as simple as those above.

The complexity in Unit 22 is due largely to the ad hoc nature of its production. The client is clearly thinking on his feet, finding correct text as he goes along.

Cl	DP	That wants something in there. I don't know will or
Pro	ack	alright
Cl	cont	I want it a process and then make decisions the most effective way is to proceed. .
	read	Focus Technology has been involved in [projects many projects
Pro	DP	I don't think you need that] actually
Cl	ack	No [well
Pro	reason	cos projects of this nature] are included do you know what I mean
Cl	ack	yeah
	altDP	I was looking for something] in that sentence really
	read	can audit process and then make
	DP	decisions based on you know our vast experience within this field or whatever .
	frame	ok
	inf	. . how about my problem here of saying pollution control was that in fact you said pollution control down here so there's a bit of a repetition there
Pro	ack	yeah

(Tape 1, Unit 22)

This Unit is composed of two DPs that build on each other, another example of the DP --- DP pattern we saw in Unit 2, although here the second DP is produced collaboratively by the pro.

In response to the initial client DP the pro accepts what he proposes. We have the typical discourse structure of

DP -- acc

Next the client starts to specify what it is he wants. The pro collaborates on the improvement of her text, and it is she who produces the DP to remove the part that the client is reading, anticipating a negative evaluation to follow the reading. The discourse sequence from this point is as follows.

[cl read] --pr DP - cl ack - pr reason - cl DP2 - frame

What happens is that the pro's DP gets minimal uptake - only acknowledgment. This is a more readily available and cooperative option in Briefing 2 decision making as we shall see shortly. Here, however, it is not an acceptable end point. Due to the staging of this activity, decisions need to be taken through to their consequences for the next draft of the text. An acknowledged DP fails to do this. The justification for this move in this data is that the pro has interrupted the client's thought processes. He ignores her DP, produces his own, and ends the Unit with a frame, `ok' as a marker perhaps that a return to collaborative decision making may take place and that he has finished thinking out the decision proposal for this section of text.

In Unit 23, the pro brings the talk back to this Unit with an upshot confirmation request to ensure that she knows what she is to do with the next draft of the text, in the light of the decisioning in Unit 22. The client provides confirmation that the pro is correct in her assumptions, and then goes on himself in Unit 24 to find accurate and detailed text to encode what he wants to say.

The basic discourse sequence for Unit 24 is as follows.

DP -- ack -- reform DP - ack -- reform DP -- O supp - IP closure

This sequence does move the talk to the end of one section of this meeting.
There is a DP - DP development to the talk here as the client reformulates and specifies the text he wants to see. Rather than a simple acceptance or receipt marker of the DP there is a more elaborate closure to this Unit, which is in fact the last text evaluation Unit in this section of the meeting. Both participants orient to this, and produce this interpersonal closure, (IP closure above) that highlights common ground shared by the two participants and professional respect.

Collaborative discourse features and a display of team work bring this stage of the talk to a satisfactory conclusion. The pro displays the fact that she is on the same wavelength as her client, firstly by means of her Other Support move (O Supp), and then in what I am calling an interpersonal closure. She says 'I know what you mean' and responds positively to the client's 'you got the message'. These might appear only to be cliches, but there is some point to them. The client does not want to have to tell the pro everything but rather to get her to think like him; to see the same corporate values that he does and to produce text accordingly. This is an issue to be taken up in part 2 of this thesis, where the rhetorical features of these meetings will be foregrounded rather than sequential ones. Having a common understanding is a way of shortening the draft check procedure, indeed of making short cuts through the whole document design process. The pro and client in this meeting do have a long and ongoing professional relationship. The pro regularly works for this company and is regularly involved in writing text for them. Knowing what the other can do, and what the other wants is an optimal situation for this kind of work and shows through the discourse features. The client rounds off this interpersonal focus by leaving the pro professional space to do her skilled work. He concludes by saying 'I'm not sure what the words are', suggesting that he has helped with the message but that it is the pro's professional expertise to turn these ideas into acceptable text.

3. Sequences that Involve Disagreement

The remaining two sequences that open with DP are more complicated in that there is some disagreement in them. They differ in terms of whose view prevails. In Unit 16 we find a run of three DPs from the client all related, each one more specific than the last.

Cl	Frame	Right.
	Focus	Process Engineering. . .
	DP	I think there's a few fundamentals that we want to

		work into this
Pro	ack	mm hmm
Cl	cont	erm if possible, which may be out there at the moment
	elab	and I've not really tried to [other than
Pro	ack	[ok]
Cl	cont	=just listing them down.
I	DP2	But the specific things that, where maybe we can differentiate ourselves from the run of the mill process engineering
Pro	ack	mm hmm
Cl	cont	=organizations, are our expertise in energy
Pro	ack	mmm
Cl	cont	=via process integration and in environmental or ecological eco engineering
	DP3	I don't know whether we could coin the term eco engineering or something here but
Pro	rej	[laugh] I don't know if Carol Feldman would be too keen on that laugh.
	conc	I quite like the terminology
	reason	but you know if we start selling eco engineering to the outside world and somebody might ask us [why we're not eco engineering
Cl	ack	[why we're not using it in house
Pro	cont	you know at Grimsby (laugh)
Cl	acc	yeah ok a bit risky
Pro	ag	yeah,
	O supp	I mean I do see what you mean
	conc	and if you were like out on your own
Cl	ack	yeah
Pro	cont	that'd be a good one to go on to
	reason	but you always do run the risk that you might get [chopped
Cl	O comp	[shooting] ourselves in the foot
Pro	cont	on the head.

(Tape 1, Unit 16)

This is the opening of the section on process engineering in the draft document and the discourse can be coded as follows.

Frame + Focus + DP - ack --- DP2 - ack -- DP3 -- negev/rej -- acc

The Unit opens with a general DP that certain fundamentals need to be worked into this piece of text. This position is acknowledged by the pro and, naturally, this leads to more specific proposals. In DP2 the client recognises this need for a more specific proposal and then provides it. He has not reached text specifics yet, but he has specified the kind of change that is required, and it is a kind of change we see asked for more than once in this document and in the technical writing draft review text, see part two for a fuller discussion. The kind of requirement, found in both technical writing and public relations, is to foreground features that separate the company or its products from its run of the mill competitors. Clients in both professional fields demand texts that fill this function.

Then the client produces the third DP. This is a specific proposal to use the term `eco engineering'. It is put forward tentatively prefaced with `I don't know whether'. This perhaps signals that something a little unusual is occurring. The DP is into an area of pro expertise, coining appropriate buzz words and phrases. For this reason the client presents the proposal for her acceptance or rejection rather than presenting it as a proposal with support, as something he has decided on. He is asking the pro to judge what sort of effect such a term might have. The pro rejects the DP with a predicted negative evaluation of it from the in house pr office. She then gives her own reasons for rejecting it, opening with a concession to show some regard for the client's positive face. The Unit closes as follows.

. . . DP3 - rej/neg ev + rej + concession + rej -- acc

This is one of very few occurrences where a client DP is overturned by the pro. I think the sequence develops the way it does to make this rejection an accessible move for the pro. The client makes the proposal but is willing to accept the pro's judgement in an area of her professional expertise, which is not otherwise the case.

The above sequence is uncommon in development but not confrontational. There is more disagreement in Unit 5. It opens with a DP from the client to put some item in the text. The Unit opens with this kind of discourse sequence.

Dp - ack - DP

Again we find a DP - DP sequence and again we find increasing specificity. `The Courtaulds Research bit' is now specified as `experience within Courtaulds' Research or something'. This is still not particularly specific but more so than DP1. At this point the pro rejects the DP with a negative evaluation of the effect such an addition to the text would have. The pro makes use of a `reason' slot three times to support her rejection and each time this too increases in specificity.

1. Doesn't sound as good as the Courtauld Group
2. Makes you look too research oriented
3. You sound like Heath Robinson boffins.

This is quite forceful and persuasive argument against inclusion. This is arguably a company issue, however, rather than a pr issue. The client does not back down as he did in Unit 16. Rather than engage in face to face disagreement, the client finds a more strategic way to support his DP. First he makes use of analogy with another brochure they have had cause to look at. He relates how they state their relationship to the parent company and closes with positive evaluation of this approach. He then relates this approach quite directly to the Courtaulds' case The pro accepts the client argument and on this occasion he gets his way.

Conclusion

The outcome of the decision making in this draft review is shaped by the work process it is a part of. The analysis here suggests that what works as effective decision making talk and getting one's own way has less to do with force of argument than features of the context. It is the job being done that determines the force and effect of the points that are made. The pro's job is to get the client's brochure written in as time effective way as possible that will be acceptable to the client company, and persuasive in the market place. At the end of the day, it is the client's brochure and it is for the pro to find appropriate ways to encode the meanings he wants it to carry. Furthermore, the long standing working relationship between the client and pro, and the late stage of this document design process minimise the need for much disagreement within a decision making task such as this one. When I compare the decision making activity in Briefing 2, the analysis will highlight how decisioning activity is shaped by the work that it forms a part of.

3. Pro Initiated Sequences

Six sequences are initiated by the pro. Of these, three are making decision proposals and three are requesting them in some way from the client.

A. Requesting a Decision Proposal

Units 1 and 6 are very similar. In both cases, although the pro speaks first, her words are in response to the visual stimulus provided by the cl's notes made on her draft text. Unit 1 opens the draft review talk.

Cl	Frame	Alright
Pro	el	Why've you got brackets round a part
	DP	of Courtauld's Research
Cl	rep	Because it got to a very stuttery start and I was trying to tighten it up a bit
Pro	ack	right

(Tape 1, Unit 1)

This is a no conflict exchange. The pro queries the underline in search of the client's decision proposal for this piece of text. His reply provides first, a negative evaluation of the draft text, and secondly, the non specific decision proposal that it needs to be tightened up a bit. This response, to show what was wrong with the original, and what could be done to improve it is the pattern of interaction, in microcosm, for much of this meeting.

Unit 6 has a similar opening discourse structure.

Pro	el DP	laugh Why do you underline "management structures"?
Cl	rep	cos I couldn't think of any. laugh.
	el	What exactly do you mean?
Pro	rep	. . . .Well some of the stuff that automation have done
Cl	el	How are they management structures?
	comm	Perhaps I don't have the same understanding of management structures that you do
Pro	rep	I suppose I'm sort of tending to use it in a process controlly kind of way
Cl	ack	yeah
Cl	inf	When I think of management structures I think of sort of
Pro	cg	I know what you mean.
	inf	I mean as in you know [computer architecture
Cl	cont	family trees]
Pro	cont	=type [way
Cl	ack	yeah]
	inf	[Or like management systems
Pro	O supp	=but it probably isn't] probably isn't the right word
Cl	DP	management systems is a bit sort of passe but I think it would to

		me mean what you think you mean
Pro	ack	ok
Cl	cont	while management structures means something entirely different

(Tape 1, Unit 6)

This time the client provides negative evaluation of the draft text in his reply, but then seeks clarification from the pro on what she might have meant in this section. This sequence functions as support for the client's written comments on the draft text. Whereas in Unit 1 the client wanted the text improved, here he wants mistaken text removed, thus there is no positive text proposal made on this item.

One can see the client strategy in handling the draft review in this way, in terms of paying attention to the long term aims of this client - consultant relationship, and not just to the short term aim of reviewing this draft text rapidly. The teacherly approach, the question answer interaction in this Unit, should be professionally worthwhile in the longer term. It will pay off the next time such terminology is relevant.

B. Making a Decision Proposal

Suz	DP	=That sentence could be changed around as well
Ian	ack	yeah
Suz	chk	so it's . . to there

(Tape 1, Unit 3)

The simple discourse patterning for this Unit is

Pro Dp - ack - self chk

The final item is the pro marking her own text, to keep track of the extent of the changes that have been agreed.

The above are all the pro initiated Units in the opening half of the meeting. There are three more Units at its close, all opening with pro decision proposals. Units 25 and 26 occur after the interpersonal closure sequence described above. There is no more text to evaluate in this section of the draft, and the pro's DPs are of a general nature. In 25 her DP gets a simple accept from the client. In 26 her DP is taken up and specified by the client. He orients to the issues he has raised, and gives a more specific proposal for the kind of extra paragraph she should write. Both the above examples are collaborative and straightforward in nature.

The Upshot Confirmation Request

Unit 23 is an example of a kind of move that the pro regularly performs. It is more likely to close a Unit than to open one. In this case there has been a change of focus and the pro is bringing talk back to an issue that she needs confirming. Her opening move takes the form of what I call an upshot confirmation request. The pro assesses the upshot of what the client has been saying, in particular relation to her own workload coming out of this meeting, and then seeks confirmation from the client that this is what he wants her to do.

Pro	upshot	yeah |I ought from what you've said
	conf req	I ought to work in some energy stuff here
Cl	conf	yeah
Pro	cont	and more stuff about process integration
Cl	cont	yeah

(Tape 1, Unit 23)

I have shown how this is a discourse feature of the designer's talk in the briefings. Clearly it is a strategy available to those who are being asked to use what is decided in a document design meeting to carry out the next stage of the process in the absence of other members of the working group. It can be seen as a role related strategy rather than as a feature of decision making therefore. It is generally available in document design talk where further work is to be carried out by one or more participants before the next group meeting takes place.

7.3 Decision Making in Briefing 2

Decision Making in Briefing 2 clearly fits the general pattern of decision making identified in Tape 1. Put crudely, there is an interactive pattern of optionally starting with a negative evaluation of the current situation leading up to, or else opening with a decision proposal that will change the proposed content of the document. This is the same framework identified for decision making in the draft review meeting. Leaving out optional support and clarificatory moves, this DP can then be followed by acceptance or rejection. If it is rejected then an alternative decision proposal (alt DP) is likely, which can also be accepted or rejected. A Unit reaches closure on the acceptance of a decision proposal. For decision making in the briefing activity, however, closure without acceptance is also available. This gives a basic decisioning model as follows.

```
                  no acceptance
                  acceptance
Neg Ev --DP --- reject ---- alt DP ----acceptance
                                   ----no acceptance
```

In the previous section, the range of routes through this pattern for Tape 1 have been described, taking account of the particular circumstances of doing a draft review. In this section the routes chosen to do decision making in a briefing are discussed, and compared with those in Tape 1, to show the different uses that a common text type can be put to in the construction of different socially situated activities.

It was shown that decision making is a key activity in a draft review. Both participants collaborate in it and reach speedy solutions to problems in order to facilitate as quick and effective a completion as possible. Briefings, on the other hand, can occur, as in Briefing 1, with hardly any decision making at all. This is a smooth running and effective procedure for such a meeting. At the opening of Briefing 2 there are a number of procedural topics produced by the pro in order to try and avoid the kind of decision making process that eventually proved inevitable. Thus decision making is an obligatory activity for draft review and a contingent one in a briefing. In this instance it is contingent on the lack of an agreed position between client and pro which means that attested information is not readily available to be formatted as information centered briefing Units for the designer. Frank has to settle for a briefing discussion in this meeting rather than simply a briefing. He has to accept a decision making process where the clients wish it, in order to be able to produce upshots of what is decided as briefing material for the designer.

The Analysis

The decision making Units to be dealt with in this section are as follows.

Decision Making Units	2, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19.

There are fewer decision making Units in Briefing 2 but these are all longer than the decision making Units in tape 1. This is indicative, then, that there was more disagreement in this briefing. This, I believe, is due to the stages of document design that these two meetings constitute. Tape 1 is near completion whereas Briefing 2 is the first chance

Bob and Frank have to discuss Frank's draft text. It is the earliest stage that involves all the key players. For this reason more time is taken over decisions, and the type of decision taken, or endings to decision sequences can be different.

All the above Units are initiated by the client. In Tape 1 a significant number were opened by the pro. This is indicative of both parties' willingness to make changes and improve the draft text. In this meeting Frank is not looking to improve the draft text so much as to have it accepted as the basis for briefing the designer. He would prefer a draft review at a later stage. On the issue of the cover at least, the client insists on having that meeting here and now.

The same two techniques that were open to the client in Tape 1 for initiating decision making activity are also available to the client in Briefing 2. He can open with a negative evaluation or with a decision proposal. There is a third related alternative, not found in Tape 1, which is to open with a problem statement.

Ways of Opening a Decision Sequence in Briefing 2

1. Opening with the statement of a problem from the client.
2. Opening with client negative evaluation.
3. Opening with a decision proposal from the client.
4. Opening with a decision proposal from the pro

Frequency of Occurrence

Type	Unit	Total Number
Type 1.	Unit 12	1
Type 2.	Units 2, 16, 18, 19	4
Type 3	Units 9, 10, 15, 17	4
Type 4	Unit 13	1

1. Opening with a Problem Statement

In Tape 1 all decision making is centered on the draft text. The client's basic choice is to negatively evaluate it and offer an improvement, or else to open with a DP for something to occur in the text. In Briefing 2, although the client takes up the option to negatively evaluate the pro's first draft text, he also has the option to state what appear to him to be problems that the document design process must overcome. When these problems are not evident in the draft text then they can be presented through opening problem statements. The problem in Units 12 and 13 concerns the visual for his brochure. Frank's draft only has words so far. Bob brings the issue up in the designer's company at this early stage of the design process. Whereas a negative evaluation, both in this meeting and in Tape 1, generally lead to a DP from its producer, the sequential development from a problem statement leaves the floor open. In fact on both occasions when a problem statement is made in this meeting, here as a decision sequence opener, and in Unit 2 nearer the sequence closure, it is the pro who addresses the problem with a decision proposal.

Whereas in Tape 1 decision proposals were concrete and had direct consequences for the next text the pro would produce, in this meeting they are more tentative and often without direct effect on action. Frank's DP here opens with 'maybe' and is no more than acknowledged by the client. He follows up with 'I don't know' which is echoed by the client. There is little of this uncertainty in Tape 1. On the one occasion where the client does say he doesn't know what words should go in the text the issue is returned to as soon as he has assembled them (Tape 1, Units 22-24). Here there is no rush to move on from uncertainty. Unit 12 ends with an agreement on what is not wanted. This I think serves a similar interpersonal function to the 'I know what you mean' talk in Tape 1. It displays the common ground and working relationship shared by the two Birmingham employees. In Unit 13 Frank opens with a DP presented unseriously but receiving positive support from both Bob and the designer. This Unit also ends with more interpersonal agreement. Both Bob and Frank have been in this situation before and there is time for some humorous interchange on using the university logo, leading into a chat phase not concerned with brochure issues at all. This marks the end of the talk on the cover that has dominated discussion since Bob's initial DP in Unit 2. Just as we found the display of common ground closing down a section of talk in Tape 1, we find the same phenomenon available here in Briefing 2 to people with a long standing working relationship.

2. Opening with a Client Negative Evaluation

Unit 2 occurs very early in Briefing 2 before the pattern of interaction for this meeting has been established. This is the client's first negative comment on the pro's draft text and it occurs immediately after he has agreed not to discuss the words but to use the text `as a discussion document for briefing Juliana' (Unit 1). Bob produces a lengthy monologic negative evaluation of Frank's title text which leads into a decision proposal, that somewhere between the two positions he has outlined and negatively evaluated there should be `a happy medium'. This DP, similar to the one produced by Frank in Unit 12, detailed above, is met with an acknowledgement move. This counts as a receipt marker but it is not found in Tape 1. The orientation in that meeting to make speedy decisions means that DPs get accepted or rejected. In Briefing 2 acknowledgement is an available option following a DP, again indicative of this meeting's early stage and the consequent lack of a need for final decisions to be taken.

Bob moves on from this acknowledgement of his DP to produce a problem statement. Rather than insist on finding solutions, as in the late stage draft review, an early stage briefing can focus more on the statement of problems that need to be dealt with. This is a feature that will occur again when we look at the technical writing data in part two of this thesis. Frank's response to this first decision making sequence in this meeting is to produce a decision proposal that is very unspecific, that Bob will be able to agree with. That accomplished, Frank attempts to move the meeting back to a more typical briefing format, providing information units for

Juliana from his briefing document.

The other two decision sequences that open with a negative evaluation occur much later in the meeting when a pattern of interaction based on decision making has been accomplished. In the first, Unit 16, we still find Frank resisting change to his plans. In Unit 18 Frank accepts the decision proposal coming from both the clients.

Unit 16

The basic pattern of interaction in this Unit is as follows

Neg Ev - Neg Ev Reject - Neg Ev Support --- DP -- acc

Both clients quite categorically negatively evaluate Frank's plan to simply list schools and faculties. Juliana rejects their view that this is `dead boring' but Bob comes up with more support for the negative evaluation of this approach; it will give the opposite message to Derek's document. This is a powerful argument not taken issue with by Frank or Juliana. What Frank does is produce a procedural decision proposal to leave things as they are for now. As much as possible, Frank is resisting the need for change at this moment in the interests of getting a briefing done quickly. As at the beginning of this meeting, we see Bob's strategy of first accepting Frank's DP, and then totally ignoring it. Here he accepts Frank's proposal to leave things alone for now only to return to the issue in Unit 18

Unit 18

The pattern of interaction here is as follows.

Neg Ev - DP - DP supp -- Accept

This time it is Frank who produces the accept, and Bob, supported by Derek, who produces the successful text changing decision proposal. When there is a definite change being proposed then the decision making is much more similar to that found in Tape 1. This is the eighteenth Unit of this meeting and it is the first time that the client has achieved a concrete change to the draft brochure. Earlier issues have been more general, more tentative or have raised relevant problems for the designer's draft visuals. In Tape 1, a draft review text, nearly every decision making Unit brings about change to the draft, very few result in maintaining the status quo. In Briefing 2 however, Frank's main strategy is to keep change to a minimum.

3. Units opening with a Decision Proposal from the Client

The four occurrences can be divided into two sections; those that involve disagreement and those that do not.

A. The Simple Pattern

In Unit 15, Bob's DP is coded as an alt DP, an alternative decision proposal, as there has already a proposal on this page from Frank that was accepted and seemingly closed down in the previous Unit. Here we see Frank accepting some change to the way he had viewed the visual presentation of this spread. He takes time to consider whether he will or won't accept the proposal, and Bob uses the space to support his DP by clarifying it. Frank accepts the proposal, albeit somewhat equivocally. This could be the end of the Unit, a tentative or uncertain agreement has been reached. In fact what happens here is that Unit 16 follows on, opening with a negative evaluation of Frank's original proposal. There is a discourse pattern in Unit 15 as follows.

DP - ack - DP support - DP acc //

Unit 16 is seen as being beyond the borders of Unit 15 as it takes issue with an earlier DP and is not evaluating the DP just made.

B. More Complicated Patterns

The common feature to these two examples is that the DP meets with rejection. In Unit 10 Bob's DP is rejected and he reformulates his position as stating a problem rather than offering a solution to the group. In Unit 17 there is initial rejection of the DP and the Unit ends equivocally. Again, this equivocation and tentativity is a feature of the decision making practice only in Briefing 2. It is a micro analytical feature of the talk made apparent through a genre level analysis of the two texts.

They clearly both make use of a decision making text type. This is a text genre common to both these social activities; for a draft review this is prototypical and for a briefing contingent. The small scale differences, however, in how the decision making text is enacted reveal key differences between these stages of the document design process. In Briefing 2, when decisions are taken they may be equivocal, uncertain in terms of the action that will follow them. Secondly, the response to a DP can be either to accept it or reject it, the only two alternatives in the draft review, or thirdly to merely acknowledge it.

Unit 17

In this Unit Bob's DP for what he would like the brochure text to say is made fun of and thus rejected by Frank. Thus we have a discourse pattern of DP --- reject. In support of his DP, Bob specifies text that could carry his favoured message. Frank's response to this is to acknowledge Bob's support but neither to accept or reject. By not actively accepting no decision is being made. It is Frank, as text writer and meeting facilitator, who has this control. In the draft review this feature of participant role is reversed. It is the client there who must accept a DP for it to become a decision. Frank ends this Unit by offering an alt DP of his own, which, again through humour, signals rejection of Bob's proposal.

Unit 9 / 10

In Unit 9 Bob produces a DP concerning the link between his document and Derek's. The only initial response to this is an acknowledgement marker form Juliana. In Unit 10 therefore Bob elaborates a detailed restatement of his DP. This is rejected by both Frank and the other client Derek. Frank puts forward a DP of his own regarding possible covers for the two documents. In response to this Bob seeks clarification as to whether Frank is talking image or photograph. Frank is tentative. He appears not to want to make these decisions at this stage, before the designer has had her chance to produce possible visuals. The issue is undecided; it is too early a stage of the process to know yet what is going on the cover. For Frank, it is an ungeneric development to the meeting to determine the cover before briefing the cover designer. Bob still follows up with a more specific version of his original two DPs regarding the link between his document and Derek's. Juliana tries to reduce some of the uncertainty by saying it will probably be a photograph. With this information Bob turns his DP into a problem statement for everyone to consider - does such a general photograph exist? The Unit ends with a tentative DP from Frank that is equally tentatively accepted by Bob.

This kind of decision lacks the force of those taken in the draft review as they do not lead directly to action. The talk is of a decision making type but at least until Unit 20 no firm decisions are taken. The discussion functions as briefing information for

Juliana. It functions to produce briefing Units for her. These do not have to reflect anything more than the latest opinion shared by the Birmingham client team. Briefing information needs to be agreed or be acceptable to all involved members of the client team. A briefing needs to present the situation in which the document is being produced, the function it is meant to have, the problems it will deal with, and the problems foreseen in its development. These are by nature less fixed issues than decisions on what should go into the near final draft of a document. It is these basic micro level features that constitute the difference in information quality and decision making practice in activities that have different purposes and occur at different stages of the document design process.

7.4 Social Activity Types

Clearly there are two distinct types of social / business interaction going on here - with different goals, different ways of unfolding and constituted by different elements. Both meetings contain a decision making element and the pattern of decision making is relatively stable across the two meetings. The elements that make up a decision making sequence, in both Tape 1 and Tape 4, and in other document design activities such as presentations can be illustrated by a system network like this.

```
                     rej ----    alt DP
neg ev  -- DP ----acc   ----------------------
                     close/ reopen
state
problem              ack --- reopen / leave
```

The model above leaves out support and clarification moves but it does capture regularities in the decision making process across contexts. Differences in decision making between my two pieces of data can be shown on a micro level by different routes taken through this basic model. This is an analytical technique that while focusing on features of genre membership common to both texts, can highlight differences within an overall framework of comparison. A complementary approach is needed that will highlight features of the different social activities that unfold in these two different meetings, an approach that captures differences in the structural elements of the interaction that construct these two activity types.

7.5 Discourse Genres and Social Genres

There is a distinction to be made between social interaction genres - a presentation, a draft check or a briefing, and discourse genres - such as narrative, exposition or, more specifically in spoken business contexts, decision making. The former are the main focus of attention of the Sydney School linguists and John Swales. The latter of such text linguists as Longacre (1983), Mayer (1992), and Beekman and Callow (1974). It is a distinction recognised by Enkvist (1991), foregrounded in Virtanen (1992), and introduced into this thesis in Chapter 2.

This thesis is largely concerned with genres of social activity. The present focus on discourse genres is due to the recognition that activities that are not fulfilling the same purpose, are not members of the same social activity genre, can share a common text type or discourse genre. There is necessarily some overlap between the two but the overlap is largely unidirectional. There are narratives, and there are detective stories or street stories. The latter two are socially situated activities that both make use of the discourse genre of narrative. Similarly, there is decision making, and then there is draft checking and briefing. The latter two are socially situated activities that both can make use of the discourse genre of decision making. It seems to me that these two genre types are separable. Socially situated genres can make use of more than one discourse genre as part of the enactment process. A business presentation consists of at least presentation elements and decision making elements, a briefing such as Briefing 2 consists of a contingent decision making element and a briefing discussion element. A discourse genre, on the other hand, can only rarely consist of a number of different socially situated genres. A narrative cannot be said to consist of a detective story and something else. In other words the two genre types are not entirely interchangeable as they refer to concepts of a different nature, of a different size, and with only one direction of fit.

7.6 Social Genres and Flowcharts

The interactional stages of document design that I have data for, and that I am calling social genres, are briefings, presentations and draft checks. These each occupy a different stage in the document design process and they have different ways of unfolding. A common element in each of them though is the discourse genre of decision making.

In order to capture the different ways these social activities unfold
I will use flow charts to show what it is that the participants are doing when they are involved in draft checking or a briefing; to show what choice they are making and from what range of options. Flow charts represent these activities as processes that unfold according to the purpose of the interaction. The flow chart helps to situate decision making in a specific social context. They have been used successfully by Ventola (1987) to show available routes through a specific social activity.

In a draft check or a briefing, each sequence that opens, opens for a limited number of purposes. This is not casual conversation. There is a far more limited range of options open to the participants, once they make the first choice - which is to stay within the confines of the specific social activity. The presence of chat phases and jokes in the data indicate that there is a tendency from time to time to step outside the genre constraints of the particular professional activity and to have a chat and a laugh, to do interpersonal work of some kind. Within the work activity of draft checking decision making is constrained by the nature of the job to be done, by draft checking in general and by the local contingencies of any one particular instance of a draft check meeting. The patterns we can see in the discourse are allowable routes through the genre structure of decision making. The particular routes taken are constrained by the kind of work the decision making is a part of, and reveal both the social process and the instance's own individual characteristics.

A decision making network need not specify which participant fulfils which element. The flow chart for the work of draft checking, by contextualising the decision making, necessarily has to indicate the likely participant roles in the interaction.

A Flowchart Representation of Client Options in a Draft Review Meeting

In this data, most sequences in the draft check open with some talk from the client. It is he who has read the draft and marked the text over which the pair are poring. The choices then open to the client appear to run as follows.

1. Do you have any negative comments to make about the text at this point?
   If NO go to 2.
   If YES continue to 1A.

(This item opens the flowchart because it will occur first if chosen. It is the most common initial element in Tape 1.)

1A. Will it help to read the offending text as you go?
[The most common choice in this data is to read it]

Then, in either case go to 1B.

1B Make your Negative Evaluation.
[This can be done in a number of ways. The way chosen will reflect characteristics of the group and the issue at hand.]

Continue to 1C

1C. Does this evaluation need some support to carry weight or is it ok as it is?
[This again is likely to depend less on generic features and more on local group qualities such as how familiar the pro is with the client's reason for the negative evaluation.]

If support is not needed go to 1D
If it is needed then add support. Give a reason for making the negative evaluation.

1D Now is the time to make a DP. If you have one ready make it now.

OR

1E If you don't make a DP it is likely that the pro will. Again this may well be a feature of this particular group's way of working. In less collaborative situations the pro might just wait for a decision to come. In more hostile situations the client DP might well be more regularly responded to with rejects and self supports from the pro rather than the here more common accept.

Again in my data at this point there is no other real choice, other than to do repair work, for example through clarificatory exchanges.

2. Above, if you decided at this point that you did not have a negative comment to make then

2A Do you have a DP to make regarding the text, especially regarding new input or reordering. These are the only reasons for this kind of opening in the Tape 1 draft review.

3. If no -
Why are you in this meeting?

The client's initiation of decision making sequences in order to improve the draft are an essential element of this kind of social interaction. Without it, it is likely that some other form of social activity is being constructed.

3. If yes
go to 3A

3A. Make a DP as opener.
Does the DP need support to be accepted? If you think so, then go to 3B.

3B Supply Support. As you are proposing changes to the pro's text and she is a professional writer this appears to be the norm, to save some face, to give a reason for interfering with her professional work space.

At its most straightforward, this DP can be followed by a pro accept.

The reasons for one choice of discourse patterning over another which this flow chart model represents are again due to the contextualising of the decision making as part of a socially situated activity, positioning it as part of a job of work being done. A job of work which at one and the same time has structural, generic features and also has its own personal characteristics. Both kinds of features become visible by working with both kinds of generic model - the system network for decision making and the flow chart for briefing and draft checking.

The flowchart shows the range of choices available in the restricted environment of a draft checking activity. It shows the limitations on choice that exist when participants are interacting within a specific social, here work, situation.

Client Options in a Briefing Discussion

A similar flow chart can be outlined for the briefing data. Again the stopping point will be the decision proposal.

Preliminaries

To reach the decision making stage of the talk

0. Finish procedural work

   As this is not such a clear cut interaction type as the draft check, some initial work may be necessary to set up the framework for this kind of interaction.

Flowchart for The Briefing Activity

1. Do you have a negative evaluation of this text?
   if not then go to 2

1A. if Yes
   either
   Make the negative evaluation
   or
   In the light of the pro's procedural work keep it for another time.
   If you make it

1B. Does it need support?
   It almost certainly does given the framework of the meeting.

1C. Do you have a better proposal?
   If so
   Make decision proposal
   Otherwise likely developments are alternative DPs or self supports from the pro.

2. Do you have a DP not on the text but on other relevant issues to this job? For example, concerning what should go on the cover or how this document should link up with others being produced.

If not go to 3.

2A. Can you just open with the DP?
If not
do some preparatory work to let the others know where you coming from and then

2B make the DP

2C. Does the DP need more support?
If so then give it.

3. Can you see a problem connected with this work that you want the group to focus on?
If not go to 4.
if yes

3A. State the problem.
This is likely to lead to some kind of DP from the pro.

4. If the answer to the above three questions is currently no then the pro should be able to brief the designer on the basis of what is currently in the spread in question, and work on the basis that this stands as shared client opinion at this stage of the document design process.

These are a similar range of alternatives to those in Tape 1, which indicates the similarity in the two work processes. Here however, option 1, the main choice made in Tape 1, to initiate a negative evaluation sequence, has been all but ruled out by the pro. He has opened the meeting with a set of procedural decision proposals that the text should not be the centre of discussion and that the document should only be used for briefing the designer. This is an example of the local management of meetings affecting generic structure. What would have been one of the client's ways of doing the briefing discussion is all but put off limits by the pro. This leads to an interaction that is less similar to the draft check. - The pro doesn't want this meeting to take on that function as well. Time constraints, not least due to the cost of the designer's time, mean that the briefing must give the designer a generally agreed view of what the Birmingham team want in their brochure without having to hammer out the content of each page in detail first. The pro is showing control over generic features of the talk by cutting out one of the decision making routes that is most time consuming and unessential to a briefing. So in this meeting option 1 is only available in extreme circumstances.

Option 2, to open with a decision proposal, is an open choice in both Tapes. In the draft check it gets made only when the client is not criticising existing text, when he want to insert some text of his own or change the order of existing text.

In Briefing 2 we find that it is more difficult to open a sequence with a DP and that work is needed to build up a position from which a DP can be offered. This kind of build up, as it occurs in the technical writing data, is analysed by means of rhetorical structure theory in Part 2 of this thesis. At the moment I see this variation as an option in how to realise this decision making element - and not as a change in the option itself.

Option 3 is the least frequent of these options in the briefing, but it is not available at all in Tape 1. This is due to the staging of these work elements in the overall document design process. In a briefing, stating problems can be seen as a way forward. The kind of problem that is raised, not knowing what to put on the front cover, or how to relate this brochure with a family of folders to follow it, are suitable problems to place before the designer at this stage. She can then go away and make decisions alone on these matters which will then be put to the group in artwork presentation meetings.

Taking none of these choices in a draft checking would mean that some other activity was taking place. In a briefing it would mean that the briefing proper could go ahead - an indication of the different value of decision making in the two activities.

7.7 CONCLUSION

Decision making has been represented here in two ways. One emphasising similarity across sites of occurrences, and one emphasising differences due to social context. As is regularly the case in this thesis two complimentary kinds of analysis have been linked within a genre analysis framework to provide a more accurate, more detailed, cross referenced description of interactive elements of document design than could be achieved using any one approach.

An altogether more comprehensive addition to available genre based analytical techniques will be pursued in the second half of this thesis.

1. See the Communicative Event Analysis for this recording in the Userguide for more detailed background information on this meeting.

2. The text for this example can be found in Appendix A

PART TWO A RHETORICAL STRUCTURE APPROACH TO GENRE

CHAPTER 8

A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF RHETORICAL STRUCTURE THEORY AND ITS APPLICATION IN GENRE ANALYSIS

8.1 Preliminaries

In this chapter I shall lay out the theoretical framework for the second half of this thesis. The chapter opens by describing the central features of rhetorical structure theory (RST) as presented by its main proponents; William Mann, Sandra Thompson, Christian Matthiessen and Barbara Fox. This will develop into an examination of how this form of analysis will be of use in the present context, and what the ramifications of its adoption as an analytical method are. This will involve consideration of the range of issues that are foregrounded by relating RST to the discourse analytic genre perspective of the first half of this thesis.

Central concerns will be the following. How successfully can RST be applied to spoken language, and what can it say about genre? How will it relate to what has been discovered from a discourse analytic approach? This chapter will evaluate the doctoral research which has been done using RST on spoken text and consider its relevance to this research. In common with these other doctoral theses (Stewart 1987 & Kumpf 1986), I am using RST to analyse spoken monolog. Unlike them, I retain the interactional framework in which the monolog occurs, as context for the monolog and to see how monolog fits into dyadic and triadic social activities. This area, the interaction between dialogue and monolog, the function of monolog in interaction and the structures of those monologs, appears unresearched in the literature. I hope to throw light on this area and to use the analysis to capture generic features of the document design texts at the centre of this research.

8.2 Focus on Technical Writing

Monolog is prevalent in the technical writing data and the focus of this thesis is now shifting to the discourse processes that constitute working practice in that field of activity. This will set up a contrast with the public relations texts, that have been dealt with thoroughly through discourse analysis. The genres of presentation, draft review and briefing have been analysed as sequential structures of interaction; optional and obligatory elements have been identified and the function of the discourse patterning has been attended to. The genres in technical writing, as social activities, are similar in nature; involving draft review and briefing. They are enacted, however, much more prevalently by monolog. (See Chapter 10, Table 10.1 for the figures). This allows a comparison of interactional events that are predominantly either dialogic or monologic, and yet which are performing, from a synoptic perspective, the same or a similar social activity. The Birmingham briefing data, in particular, allows for some reconsideration of this social interaction as a mix of monolog and dialogue, making it possible to judge what is achieved in each talking styles, and what motivates change from one to the other.

8.3 RST and Genre

RST is a suitable tool for detailing the structure of monolog and for identifying points of completion and possible completion in such talk. It is hypothesised that RST analysis of monolog will highlight generic features of these social practices, to stand alongside the findings from the discourse analysis part of this thesis.

My approach to genre up to now has been influenced by the work of the Sydney school; of Ventola (1987, 1988, 1989), Martin (1981, 1984, 1985), and Hasan (1984, 1985). It has focused on the sequential structure of unfolding text viewed in a dynamic and synoptic perspective. Genre in the Sydney school is viewed as staged and goal directed. On the discourse plane it is seen as being realised through the systems of conversation structure, conjunction, reference and lexical cohesion. The most successful systemic applications of genre analysis to spoken language, however, have been in terms of conversation structure and conjunction. These are systems that focus on, or, from a different perspective, largely constitute the sequential structure of interaction. Systemicists have been less successful in making claims for the generic nature of texts as realised by the discourse systems of reference and lexical cohesion (see Ventola 1987 for an admission of this point).

The use of Rhetorical Structure Theory should both enhance the sequential style of analysis, and offer some access to aspects of genre less obviously sequential. RST will enhance by offering an alternative analysis of monolog as discourse (cf. Coulthard & Montgomery 1981). RST enables a two stage analysis of the structure of monolog. It is viewed firstly in terms of its internal structure, and then in terms of that structure's interactional significance. Different aspects of genre accessible through RST involve some focus on texture and coherence rather than sequential structure. These are central issues in the work of Hasan (1985) and Lemke (1988, 1989, 1990), and also feature in Hoey (1991).

The sequential approach will remain dominant here; monolog is seen as occurring within an interactional framework. However, within this framework, RST will show the hierarchic structure of the monologs; it will show why they are coherent and why they have texture. Generic features of texts should be discoverable through this kind of analysis. Hasan's notion of texture and Lemke's concepts of intertextuality and thematic formation will be introduced and discussed later in this chapter in support of this position. All these issues, which are linked by the common thread of what is thrown up when RST is used on the document design data, will be addressed in more detail as this chapter unfolds and assesses key features of Rhetorical Structure Theory.

8.4 RST An Introduction

At this point I want to start with the basics of RST and provide an outline description of the mechanics and aims of the approach. The mechanics of RST and its core aims are consistently presented in the literature, (see e.g. Mann & Thompson 1988, Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson 1991, Matthiessen and Thompson 1989 and Fox 1987). Emphasis varies from one article to another, regarding a focus on one or a particular group of relations, or on the connections between grammar and RST, but the theoretical framework itself is consistent in all the above articles. Here I want to outline the theory and then to comment on the qualities that its proponents claim for it that bear relation to this research.

Basic Elements of RST

RST highlights relations in text. These relations can be clause to clause or between much longer pieces of text. It is further claimed that the relations do not alter depending on the scale of the text unit in question. This makes RST seem both more comprehensive and more economical than other types of text analysis (Winter, Hoey, Meyer, Jordan). Matthiessen and Thompson make the claim:

> Now, if the number of relations one needs to posit to describe the relational structure of any coherent text turns out to be relatively small, and if precise definitions of those relations can be given then we have the foundations for a theory of the organisational structure of texts
> (Matthiessen & Thompson 89, p.290)

This is the situation, they claim, that does hold. There is a limited number of relations around 20 (See Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson 1992 or Mann &

Thompson 1988 for a full description). The set of relations varies only very slightly between Fox, Mann and Thompson, Stewart and Kumpf. Stewart adds Disjunct as a relation, which is acknowledged by Mann and Thompson, but thought to be not clearly enough defined for inclusion. Kumpf adds a means of dealing with reported speech, which is common in her data. Fox uses slightly different terminology; what she calls Opposition is Antithesis in Mann and Thompson and she subsumes the relations of Elaboration, Evidence and Background under the Issue relation (Fox 1987). Mann & Thompson themselves repeatedly claim that the list is not a closed one. There is a balance however, a trade off between the analytical power of handling all text with a limited number of relations and the delicacy of analysis that more relations might offer. As far as Mann, Thompson and Matthiessen are concerned, they are using all the relations they have found, and that they need for the job. I suspect that when applying RST to discover generic features of text that there will be a need for either a change in the relations; some new and some not used at all, or alternatively that existing relations will benefit from sub-classification. In the sample RST Analysis Chapter that follows I raise the issue regarding the Justify relation which can be used to label a number of quite different text relations. Further analysis might show that calling them all Justify is no help in recognising generic features in these texts but that by sub-classifying types of Justification that generic uses of rhetorical relations will become apparent.

Terminology

The terminology of RST is light. It makes a few key concepts work hard (Mann and Thompson 1988 & 1992 give good accounts). The concept of structure is important. RST describes a text by giving a structure to it. RST is a theory of relational structure, glossed by Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson 1992, p.41 as `structure expressing the organisation of coherent contiguous text'. They say they recognise two other kinds of structure, syntactic structure and holistic structure, concerning `genre or variety of text', but that RST `does not attempt to incorporate accounts of either genre or syntax' (ibid, p.41). They say that analysis that combined RST with either of these two other kinds of structure would be `particularly interesting'. I agree, I have found no published work that uses RST as a tool for genre analysis, as I propose to do. I will develop this point when I discuss the Ph.D work on spoken language using RST. Mann and Thompson themselves use current understanding and recognition of text type as a means of choosing texts to analyse with RST. Their aim has been to show the applicability of the theory to a wide range of short written expository texts, (ibid, p.42). It is for this thesis to turn the analytical process in reverse; to start with a set of texts that one hypothesises connection between; either of genre or intertextuality (Lemke passim), and then to apply RST analysis to these texts in search of the generic features they may possess. This issue will also be developed later in this chapter when I discuss intertextuality and the work of Lemke in some detail.

Structure in RST consists of relations and spans. Relations identify the kinds of relationship that can hold between two pieces of text. These are defined most comprehensively in Mann & Thompson 1988 and Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson 1992. A text span is that stretch of text for which the relation in question holds. It can range in size from clause to clause upwards. Schema is a term applied more commonly in earlier papers (Mann & Thompson 1987, 1988), to the representation of relations in RST. Schemas show the hierarchic nature of text; how spans functionally decompose into smaller spans. Hierarchy is a central tenet of rhetorical structure theory. Relations consist most commonly of a nucleus and satellite, or less commonly of two nuclei. Relations are functional; they describe the plausible reason why two pieces of text have been placed next to each other. More recently the nature of this relation has been specified more delicately as consisting of constraints and effects. Constraints on the nucleus, constraints on the satellite and constraints on the combination. Effects are plausible judgements by the analyst of the effect the writer is attempting to produce in the reader through the relation. Effects are either situated in the nucleus alone or in both nucleus and satellite. See Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson (1992) for a detailed description of this feature. Each relation is precisely defined in this way. When the locus of effect is only on the nucleus then the relation between nucleus and satellite is one of essential and non-essential. When the locus of effect is on both parts then the claim is that there is a relation of `symbiosis' between nucleus and satellite (Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson (1992, p.50).

A claim made by Mann & Thompson is that by tracing all the nuclear elements of a text and discarding all the satellites, one is left with a coherent summary of the text. There would appear to be an element of circularity in this argument, in that it is only the analyst's view of the importance of the text that establishes the nucleus as being more essential than the next or former piece of text that is the satellite part of the relation. That said, the principle is meant to hold throughout the text and to produce a coherent, if not of course, a logically connected piece of text. This means that the choice of nucleus for one span must be compatible with the other choices made and thus produce a complete coherent text. In practical terms one can use this feature of RST to check one's own analysis for coherence. If it is lacking then for impromptu spoken text it is possible to locate the cause either in poor analysis or in poor turn construction. If the analysis holds up then, this principle of nuclearity is a way of evaluating the likely effect of the piece of talk. In a very detailed fashion one is able to offer candidate accounts for why a monolog, in part or even in whole is not producing the required effect. Overall effects need to be specified in terms of genre and the sequential placement of the monolog as a genre element or part element. This is a feature to be fully developed in the RST Genre Analysis in Chapter 10.

8.5 The Assumptions Behind RST

The next section considers a number of claims made cumulatively for RST through the Mann, Thompson and Matthiessen literature, and compiled as a set of assumptions in Mann, Matthiessen & Thompson 1992.

Each of these assumptions will be addressed in turn and I will use this as a framework to discuss the relations between RST and discourse analysis, genre analysis and other clause relational approaches, notably that of Hoey and Winter.

Assumption 1 A Functional Approach

Their first claim made is that texts are organised out of 'functionally significant parts'. RST then is a functionalist theory of text and is to this extent compatible with the systemic type approach to genre and the discourse analytic perspective of the earlier chapters. RST does, however, focus attention more on semantic structure than on sequential structure. For spoken language, this is a rich site for discovering meaning that takes place within a turn rather than between turns. I am not saying that RST analysis would have nothing to say about the structure of talk built up between participants, but the primary aim here is to apply RST to monolog. These texts are sequentially placed, but internally they have a hierarchic structure that constructs, in an only part sequential fashion, a set of related meanings that will function as a turn, and have interactional significance. The way this works, the way monolog fits into an interactional framework will be described in the RST Genre Analysis in Chapter 10.

Assumption 2 Unity and Coherence

The second assumption is that texts have unity and coherence and that every part of a text contributes to this. I would suggest that this is probably true for the short written expository texts that RST generally addresses. Most of these have either been published or at least publicly displayed. For writers or speakers in other genres, such as those dealt with in this thesis however, and for writers who are novice or candidate members of a discourse community, who are coming to terms with the constraints and demands of the community's written forms of communication, I would suggest that such coherence is only an aim rather than a given for the texts being produced. The same is true for children learning to write at school, (See the work of Christie 89, Martin 87 Rothery 87 and Kress 85 on this issue). For spoken language, Lemke (1990a) shows how for children learning science at school, being able to use the genres that science is handled in is a large part of the learning process. Some of what he says could be restated as children needing to learn to produce coherent talk and writing on scientific subjects. In the data at hand, talk is produced in an interactive professional setting. There are time constraints on message production and genre constraints on message relevance. The participants have varying degrees of familiarity with producing the kinds of texts necessary to achieve the goals of briefing and draft checking. Given these circumstances I would say the chance of all the texts analysed here having unity and coherence is virtually nil.

This disagreement with Mann & Thompson has I suspect less to do with principle than the direction of fit between analysis and text type. Mann & Thompson choose texts that can be assigned to various text types on the basis of current text analysis or clear social function. Some of the example text types they have analysed include memos, letters to the editor, advertisements, abstracts and travel brochures. The range of text types is broad, but one thing they all have in common is that they are very likely to have been carefully crafted. They stand then as good example texts to build up the principles of rhetorical structure theory. If texts such as these did not have coherence and unity, at least to a degree, then we would need some other kind of analysis. The direction of fit then for Mann and Thompson is from known text type to theory development. For this thesis the order is reversed. The aim here is to adequately analyse text rather than build theory. Mann and Thompson used text types to establish a theory. I want to use the theory to establish characteristics of text types, or rather speech genres (Bakhtin 86) or activity structures (Lemke 88). This should have a feedback effect on the theory, and allow certain claims may to be modified from a genre perspective. I do expect a large degree of coherence, otherwise there would be no point using RST. I also expect some degree of incoherence in these monologs.

This incoherence may well be in functional terms; speakers producing text that goes off the point and loses its function in the interaction. Some examples will be given in Chapter 9. The incoherence will be an aspect of the genre constraints on the type of talk that is under way. I hope to use RST to pinpoint its location and the kind of meaning loss that occurs when talk does go 'off genre'. One doesn't expect written texts of the short expository polished kind used by Mann and Thompson to go 'off genre'. Writers can go back to the synoptic product and realign their text with their purpose, or change their purpose to suit the text if they wish. This is of course impossible in speech. Once uttered, talk can be retracted but not eradicated. Going 'off genre' can be accounted for as error or as unfamiliarity with the genre's speech structures, or alternatively as the individual releasing himself from the constraints of a genre and choosing to produce talk in a less restricted way. See Lemke 1990a for support for this position. Spoken text then needs to be seen as capable of being coherent, and in this research this quality will be understood in generic terms. Talk can become less coherent by failing to function as the required genre element In any case, it is expected that RST, within a genre analysis framework, will be a most useful analytical tool for locating those functions in monolog that regularly are constituting genre elements or part elements. This knowledge can then be used as a standard for recognising when the element is not properly realised and precisely where the problem lies. In other words apart from, and not denying the claim that Mann and Thompson make about unity and coherence, RST can be put to good use in locating types of generic failure in spoken monologic text.

Assumption 3 Purpose

The third assumption is that this unity and coherence arise from imputed function. They go as far as to say

> A (region of) text is perceived as having unity and coherence because all of its parts are seen as contributing to a single purpose of the writer, i.e. as created to achieve a single effect.
> (Mann & Thompson 92, p.43)

To the extent that this is a fully functionally based theory of text then RST is in company with Halliday 1978, Hasan 1985, Hoey 1983 and Lemke (passim). Language is structured the way it is because of the social uses to which it is put. To the extent that they insist on a 'single purpose', on unity, I think they part company with the above. In addition to the quote above, they continue;

> As an alternative some have assumed that unity and coherence come from conformity to a familiar pattern in the subject matter, such as temporal sequence or repeated reference to a character. Others find it in more abstract semantic patterns such as hyponymy and meronymy.
> (ibid, p.43)

What they cite as alternatives are in fact some of the standard ways of finding cohesion or coherence in a text (Halliday and Hasan 1976, Lemke 90a & b, Hasan 85). Hasan 1985 and Hoey 1991 look at meronymy and hyponymy as a source of coherence in text. Lemke looks for what he calls thematic formations and rhetorical structure which could be glossed as 'conformity to a familiar pattern in the subject matter'. I want to deal with these approaches later and suggest ways in which they may be seen as compatible with RST and to some degree recoverable through an RST approach. For now, suffice to say that assuming a writer has a purpose is not incompatible with looking for coherence in terms of regularly occurring patterns of text, or in terms of texture caused by patterns of lexical cohesion. The patterns found by such analysts, especially Lemke and Hasan, who are both genre oriented, can be used to help account for a writer's purpose in a text and also to account for typical ways in which certain kinds of subject, such as science (Lemke 1990a) get talked about. Writers and speakers are not, in a generic approach, totally free to choose their purpose; there will be constraints on purpose due to the subject matter. In our culture, science isn't gossiped about and as Martin points out (Martin 1984) people don't give lectures on house cleaning. Writers' and speakers' purposes cannot be seen as totally free choices then, which we can focus on in a context free manner. Writers do have purposes but they are constrained, delimited by field of activity, by tenor and by mode, and can be viewed in text in terms of the genre in which their texts are constructed. In this way one's approach can be more centrally textual and less absolutely concerned with the intentions residing in a speaker's head.

In some respects however, Mann & Thompson are refreshing in the approach they take to purpose. They do not insist on an ethnomethodological rigidity for discovering it or recovering it from talk. Rather they say the judgements they make about purpose and intention are plausibility judgements. This is a cover that appears in all the RST texts. In Mann and Thompson 1988 they write

> One goal of this paper is to make it possible to identify the involvements of the analyst's judgement in the analysis. In this view of analysis the analyst has access to the text, has knowledge of the context in which it was written, and shares the cultural conventions of the writer and the expected readers, but has no

> direct access to either the writer or other readers. Since such judgements cannot be certain, they must be plausibility judgements. In effect every judgement of the completed analysis is of the form `It is plausible to the analyst that . . .'
> (Mann and Thompson 88, p.245-6)

This is a bedrock statement for RST. It is centrally concerned with the purpose and goal of the text encoder and it will access these in an analyst centered manner, by allowing him/her to make plausibility judgements on the writer or speaker's intentions. Mann and Thompson add the justification above, that the analyst not only has access to the text but he also knows the context and the cultural conventions it operates within. Here again we find Mann and Thompson writing text that has a theory building purpose. This means they try to control all variables and see if the theory is compatible with a range of different values. This is a necessary step in the development of a new theory of text, and is prior to any application of such a theory. Mann and Thompson's purpose is to spread word of the theory, to develop the theory, and to make links between the theory and other compatible and incompatible approaches. What their analyses do not do is reveal important features of the text itself, such as its genre and its context of situation and context of culture, (Halliday 1978 & Malinowski 1923).

Part Two of this thesis is an application of rhetorical structure analysis. The main purpose of this is to reach an understanding of the contexts of culture and situation for public relations and technical writing documentation processes, and the genres through which these cultures function. The aim of using RST is not to promote or test the theory but to apply it in order to explain what I don't know about context and genre. RST analysis is not something I can do because I share such knowledge with the producer and recipient of the texts I analyse, but is something I can use to extend my knowledge in those areas. It is because I don't share the professional context of culture with public relations people, technical writers and their clients, and because I don't know which genres they make use of to carry out their work that this thesis exists, and that rhetorical structure theory is a part of it.

To return to the assumption that I am taking issue with, I do not view purpose in such an isolated fashion. I do not think that unity and coherence are solely due to the writer's purpose. In this analysis the purposes of a text are functions of the work that needs to be done. I think there are familiar patterns of talk that occur in public relations and technical writing. I think that thematic formations (Lemke 1985, 1988 & 1990a) and texture (Hasan 1985) are likely to be generic in nature, to vary meaningfully according to the activity structure being enacted. Given that I am dealing with an interactional activity, there are likely to be a number of purposes abounding, so Mann and Thompson's insistence on unity of purpose is unlikely to hold up for spoken interaction. The General RST analyses in Chapter 9 show how talk can be aimed at different participants for different purposes.

Arguably one can say that the activity has a single macro function; in the data here either to brief the consultant or to review his or her draft text. This general purpose however is multifaceted and consists of a number of elements. In short, there is nothing to be gained for my understanding of these professional communicative events by viewing them as having a single purpose.

Assumption 4 The Hierarchical Structure of Text

Mann and Thompson's fourth assumption is that text has a hierarchical structure. This is not a belief held by RST alone. It is central to the text analysis of Longacre 1983, Beekman and Callow (1974), and Mayer (1992), and many others too. It is not a foregrounded feature of the clause relational analysis of Winter, Hoey or Jordan however. An insistence on hierarchy makes for differences between RST and the work of Hoey and Winter which are otherwise fairly compatible. The claim for hierarchy is the more strident position and means that texts are always analysed in their entirety. It also accounts for Mann and Thompson's fifth assumption, which is that there is only one set of structural patterns available for organising text at every scale. This gives RST its potential, as Matthiessen and Thompson 1987 claim, to be a powerful theory and an economical one for the organisation of text structure.

Hoey and Winter see types of clause relations, very similar to Mann and Thompson's; clause - consequence, condition - consequence, hypothetical - real. They see these low level relations forming larger discourse patterns; problem - solution, general - particular, and matching. Hoey and Winter do not always analyse every last clause of a text; they are not looking for relations inside relations building up a hierarchy to a top level relation. They make generalisations about the relation between clause relations and discourse patterns. They say that every problem - solution pattern has a cause consequence relation at its heart (Hoey 1986). They do not account however for every piece of text as necessarily being in a hierarchical relation with each other. There is no hierarchical relation between situation, problem, solution and evaluation. They are elements of a discourse pattern that are likely to co-occur. For Mann and Thompson there is one set of relations and these are hierarchic. This does allow one to see low level relations in text, that hold between small sections of it, working as part of larger relations of text that play a more central role in the organisation and rhetorical force of a text.

The RST sample analyses, and my own use of it convince me that it is possible to assign rhetorical structure to texts and that generally this empowers a rhetorical analysis of text in terms of its top level organising relations and the relations with which they typically and regularly combine. See Chapters 9 and 10 for worked examples of just this. RST also allows one to see how even high level relations in a text, or discourse patterns in Hoey and Winter parlance, can overlap or co-occur. Multiple relations are acknowledged by Winter and Hoey but are presented as a problem in Hoey 1986. In RST however one can see Solutionhood as a high level text organising pattern within which there are, for example Enablement relations. There are also texts where the pattern is reversed; Solutionhood occurs within a top level Enablement relation. I think that by consideration of the way patterns of rhetorical organisation occur and importantly co-occur in texts, that is enabled by RST, that I will be able to reveal generic features of the texts in question. Of course this cannot be done from one or two sample instances of a text type that RST usually works with. The data for this thesis runs to some 50 or 60 analysed monologs from only two basic activity types, briefing and draft check, so I think that I have the weight of data to support the claims I shall make for generic qualities evinced through RST.

I do not think the Hoey - Winter analysis of text inferior in any way to RST but I do not think it would be as likely to reveal generic features. No genre specific claims have been made for the kinds of text organisation found in their analysis.

A further reason is that Hoey and Winter's clause relational approach is firmly semantic. The type of relations it posits between clauses and the patterns in texts are mainly semantic. RST, as its name suggests gives itself a broader brief. I think it achieves rhetorical status by combining an analysis of semantic relations with pragmatic ones, (Ford 1987). Winter and Hoey overlap with RST on the semantic front. They both account for such relations as condition, result, consequence and elaboration. Only RST has such relations as Enablement, Motivation, Evidence and Justify. It is commonly these pragmatic relations that are not signalled in the lexicogrammar. They are relations that the analyst has to read into the text as a plausible account of why that text was created. Again it is not only because I share common contexts of culture and situation with these text producers that I can impute these text functions, it is because I have a large number of examples, and because I have amassed knowledge of the genres they are working in through other kinds of textual analysis. Jointly, this lets me make plausible analyses of texts with top level rhetorical structures that occur and reoccur. My belief that a certain pragmatic function holds in a monolog is strengthened by finding a similar pattern of rhetorical relations in the same and other similar texts. Conversely, as I find similar patterns of relation within monolog, I can build up to establishing similar high level functions for similarly structured stretches of text. In this way, as Ventola (1989) says, rhetorical structure theory really can be a top down and bottom up approach to text. Ventola (1989) finds RST's claims in need of substantiation. This analysis is meant to function as part fulfilment of that need.

It is on pragmatic grounds, then, that I accept as workable the notion of hierarchy in texts and the additional type of clause relations in RST compared to those that Hoey and Winter work with. It yields results. I am not happy, however, to be as singularly minded as Mann and Thompson. As contrasting, incompatible approaches to text organisation they list `adjacency patterns' and `linearly related chains of clauses or semantic propositions'. `Adjacency patterns' is unspecified, but surely can be taken to mean adjacency pairs as found in Conversation Analysis (Sacks, Schegloff, and Jefferson 1974), or the patterns of moves that make up exchanges in Birmingham school approaches to spoken discourse, (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975). Linearly related chains of clauses seems to be a reference to Hoey and Winter's clause relational analysis and I shall return to this issue shortly.

Clause Relational Analysis and Discourse Analysis

It is of great interest that Mann and Thompson prefer their approach to text organisation over approaches that have been shown to work for spoken data. Hoey too (Hoey 1986) suggests that clause relational analysis can and should be extended to make speech act relations a sub category of clause relations, (ibid, p.210). Hoey's sample text that he uses as a basis for this claim is dialogue in a work of fiction. In other words it is spoken text occurring within a framework of on going written monolog. Similarly the basis for the RST claim is produced solely from a written text perspective. It is not for nothing that the analysis of spoken text has worked on the principle of sequentiality and not of text hierarchy. It has been shown to work both in the form of Discourse Analysis and Conversation Analysis. Birmingham school discourse analysis has explored the nature of hierarchy in spoken text. It is a point returned to in Sinclair 1985. In this later paper, however, hierarchic aspects of discourse are seen as upsetting to the fundamental quality of spoken language as sequential.

> Any utterance can follow any utterance - we are free agents. Although we tend to follow conventions in social behaviour, there are no absolute rules, because people make mistakes or make use of the conventions for more subtle purposes, irony, and so forth. However each

> utterance sets the scene for the next. No matter what it is the way it will be interpreted is determined by the previous utterances, and in particular the immediately previous one.
> (Sinclair 85, p.15)

Sinclair's aim in this paper is to offer a descriptive system to account for structure in all forms of text. Unlike Hoey or Mann and Thompson he approaches this task from a spoken text perspective. For both spoken and written text, however, he insists on a dynamic perspective. This has been taken up and developed by Martin and other systemicists into a synoptic and dynamic approach to spoken language, (Martin 1985). It is a perspective that is welcomed by Hoey also. A clause relational approach to written text, due to its partial reliance at least on `linearly related chains of clauses or semantic propositions' (Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson 92), can focus on dynamic aspects of written text. As Hoey and Winter conclude;

> Written discourse "flows", and clause relational analysis has at least the merit of recognising the fact.
> (Hoey & Winter 86, p.139)

The point I am attempting to develop here is that quality linguistic approaches to text from the eighties onwards has started to look for ways of treating written and spoken text in a similar way. Computational approaches to speech and writing in the work of Biber (1988) for example have shown that text purpose is a far more revealing differential factor for texts that whether they occurred in the spoken or written mode. Nevertheless a unified analytical approach to both spoken and written text is still lacking. The Sinclair model is provocative but has not been developed. There is no Birmingham school type analysis of written text just as there is no conversation analytic work on writing. For those who have started out from a written text perspective, there are promises and hopes of dealing with spoken text (Hoey 1983, p.187-88), but not much development. Hoey and Winter do approach written text as a dynamic process. Their method of revealing clause relations by inserting plausible reader questions to identify the function of the next chunk of text does emphasise that writing too is an interactive task. Hoey 1986 does attempt to bring speech act analysis and clause relation analysis into contact with one another but because the data used to make the relation is all written, I think the nature of the relation gets skewed. Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson's insistence on hierarchy as being the elemental feature of text organisation is also skewed by their written text perspective. They do say in the conclusion of their most recent publication that

> RST has not yet been effectively related to dialogue. It must be expanded beyond written monologue to dialogue and multilogue in order to encompass a fully representative range of the functions of language.
> Mann, Matthiessen & Thompson 92, p.68)

There has been doctoral work on spoken narrative (Kumpf 1986) and spoken monolog (Stewart 1987), and these will be discussed once the core assumptions of

RST have been attended to and assessed. They do not deal with interaction however. One aim of this thesis to redress the balance. To offer analysis that focuses at the interface of speech acts and clause relations. This is what Hoey promised to do in 1983 and has attempted in Hoey 1986. He does make a point that is quite central to the approach being developed here.

> ...for speakers to contribute appropriately to the structure being mutually built they must first have processed what has been said by both participants in a manner similar to that they would use in processing written discourse
> (Hoey 86, p.211)

I do not agree however that speech act analysis needs to be subsumed within clause relations. This analysis will use both RST, a type of clause relational analysis, and my own version of Birmingham school discourse analysis, in order to approach an analysis of spoken dialogue and multilogue in a way that accounts for both sequential structure and hierarchic structure of text. The approach is both dynamic and synoptic. I think RST is a useful tool for recognising how a spoken text, a spoken monologic text unfolds. RST analysis shows points of completion and possible completion. The existence of another, an addressee, allows us to support the RST based analysis by noticing his or her timing of attempted turn transitions that show an awareness that the other speaker's extended turn may be ending that coincide with major junctions in the monolog's organisational structure, (see Chapter 9 for an example of this).

Attention will also focus on the nature of completed or at least terminated hierarchical rhetorical structure in the monologs in a search for recurrent patterns of organisation. All the texts come from just two professional fields and two basic activities. I hypothesise recurrent rhetorical structure patterns in texts of the same activity. Links between texts belonging to the same field will also be investigated using RST. Compatible theoretical approaches to this will be discussed later with key reference to the work of Lemke and Hasan.

RST analysis then is being carried out on monologic stretches of texts. These stretches, however, are not free standing or in any way complete text units. They are always part of an activity structure that involves two and sometimes three or even four participants. This ongoing structure, as it occurred in the public relations data, has been analysed for sequential generic features. It is assumed, and this second wave of analysis will have to bear out the assumption, that the technical writing texts belong to the same or similar, agnate, genres. What is to be the main focus of attention here, however, is the functioning of the monologic units of talk that constitute so much of the technical writing data.

This thesis will not consist of just one form of analysis applied to all texts. Rather it is two kinds of analysis combined in order to reveal more about the activities being accomplished in the data than either would alone. This isn't a synthesis of analyses so much as an extension or combination of analytical approaches. Just as clause relational analysis (I am categorising RST as a kind of clause relation analysis) works by seeing semantic function in texts in terms of the relations that hold between its clauses or groups of clauses, and sees 'the meaning of words in combination [as] greater than their meaning apart' (Hoey & Winter 1986, p.121), so the same holds true for the relation of these analytical approaches. What I can learn by performing RST analysis on these texts is infinitely extended by relating that analysis to the sequential placement of the monologs within a structure that is not revealable by RST, but rather by the discourse model developed in Part One of this thesis. Conversely, monologic text that is analysed by discourse analysis can reveal how it is taken by the other participants, and the range of possible responses that they can and do make to it. Due to their length and hierarchical structure, however, discourse analysis does not do a very good job of explaining what it is, as a semantic or semantic / pragmatic unit, that the response is being made to.

The monologs have meaning and function not discoverable by the assignment of a move or speech act label. Neither I think are their functions capturable by a macro speech act approach (Van Dijk 1977). Van Dijk defines a macro speech act as;

> ... certain sequences of various speech acts (that) may be intended and understood and hence function socially, as one speech act.
> (van Dijk 77, p. 238)

He gives examples of speech act sequences that function wholly as a request or a promise. The structures I am dealing with however do not have such a clearly available macro function. They are not whole units; rather they are semantic structures occurring with meaningful sequential positioning. Using discourse analysis it has proved possible to analyse these stretches of talk in terms of their constituent speech acts or moves and to name the macro act as briefing, presenting, draft reviewing or decisioning. It is this kind of functional behaviour that I have been grappling with the mechanics of in the first half of this thesis. The monologic units, however, do not necessarily represent complete macro speech acts; one needs the contributions of the other in order to see the construction of such macro acts as decisioning or briefing. Secondly, the analysis here is a semantic analysis that holds through the relation of clause to clause, and clause group to clause group. The product of such a semantic and pragmatic analysis is not of the same order of speech acts. Part of the aims of this analysis will be to find a comfortable fit for discourse analysis and clause relational analysis.

Hoey recognises the important referential aspect to clause relations. It is not only the relation that is important but the real world items that the relation is posited to hold between. Problem - Solution patterns require reference to whose problem and whose solution. Answers to these questions need to be provided before one can see a pattern as complete or incomplete, (Hoey 1986, p.195-6). For Hoey, a fundamental difference between speech acts and clause relations is that speech acts, or rather moves in a Sinclair & Coulthard context, exist in a sequential relation that has predictive power. Clause relational analysis `is in terms of semantic relationships and describes patterns of organisation with no claims to predictive power', (ibid, p.209). I think Hoey is right in the kind of distinction he is making between discourse analysis and clause relational analysis, although I do hypothesise that a different kind of predictive power may be associated with a clause relational approach. This should be particularly true when looking at texts, as I am now, that are closely related, either in terms of field of action, genre or both. This is an issue to be discussed at greater length later in connection with the work of Lemke and Hasan in particular.

Assumption 5 Discourse and Grammar

The fifth assumption is one already touched on; what Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson call `Homogeneity of Hierarchy' (Mann, Matthiessen & Thompson 1992, p.43). By this they mean the notion of one set of structural patterns, one set of <u>relations</u> to account for the organization of text at every level, from clause upwards. The clause is seen, much as in systemic linguistics, as the basic independent meaning carrying unit. Hasan puts it this way

> ... it is only message as message that has any textual viability; and it is only at the rank of clause or above that a lexico - grammatical unit is contextually viable. It is only at this rank or above - that a linguistic unit can encode a complete message.
> (Halliday & Hasan 85, p.91)

Halliday 1985 also talks about `clause as message' (Halliday 1985, p.38-67), when discussing theme and rheme constituents of messages, of parts of clauses.

Martin 1983b also uses the term `message' to mean clause viewed semantically as the unit of meaning that conjunctions tie together.

Clause relations analysis and RST are centrally concerned with messages and the relation between messages. RST is alone I think in explicitly claiming that larger messages, those constituted by groups of related clauses, are linked by the same relations as individual clause to clause. Mann and Thompson specifically oppose their model to those that involve a rank scale hierarchy of relations, such as we find in Sinclair and Coulthard 1975. This is a point I am sympathetic to. My own version of discourse analysis plays down the rank scale elements of the original Birmingham work. It is a looser, less rigid approach aimed at discovering genre elements, which Sinclair and Coulthard, back in 1975 never considered. In their terminology my approach is at the level of `transaction' or `lesson', which I consider the discourse units most likely to be the site of generic regularity. In contrast, the Birmingham work is focussed on the exchange. This was the unit above move in the rank scale system. Moves were often complete utterances made up of no more than a clause. Focus on exchange was a way of looking for a grammar of discourse. It was an attempt to describe the features of discourse in grammatical terms. This is not a feature of my work and even Sinclair has since renounced such an aim, (Sinclair 1992, p.7). What Sinclair is calling for in this article is a discourse analysis that is not grounded in grammar.

> While using familiar tools (i.e. grammar) is a reasonable tactic for getting started, we

> organised like a clause.
> (Matthiessen & Thompson 89, p.300)

The clause is the unit where grammar operates. The kinds of structure found there are not like the structures found in rhetorical structure analysis. However, from the level of clause complex upwards, once there is a relation of whole message to whole message and this relation is a functional relation, then there is consistency in the way whole texts relate and individual clauses relate. A substantial part of the theoretical focus of RST work has been on grammar, in Matthiessen & Thompson 1989 in particular. They look to reverse the order in which explanations of one system in terms of another have traditionally been made. Instead of treating discourse as being like grammar only larger, they try to explain grammatical features of English as the result of discourse structure and function. Thus the hypothesis in Matthiessen & Thompson 1989 is;

> Clause combining in grammar has evolved as a grammaticalization of the rhetorical units in discourse defined by rhetorical relations.
> (ibid, p.301)

They make the connection down from discourse features of English, which they naturally handle in RST terms, to grammatical features of clause combining for which they use Halliday's functional grammar, (Halliday 1985). The particular connection they hypothesise is that an enhancing nucleus - satellite rhetorical relation is typically grammaticalised as an enhancing hypotactic clause. All the findings of this article are not relevant

> should also work towards a model of discourse which is special to discourse and which is not based upon the upward projection of descriptive techniques, no matter how similar we perceive the pattern to be.
> (ibid, p.7)

I see this as support for my looser approach to discourse analysis, that now has a discourse foundation rather than a grammatical one. It is also support for clause relational analysis and RST. Hoey and Winter explicitly claim that the clause relations they identify are discourse relations and not grammatical ones. They state;

> These patterns are only a sample of the range of patterns available to a writer. . . . . In any case since they are patterns built out of clause relations, not quasi grammatical structures the number of patterns that may occur is theoretically unlimited, and all that one can hope to do is describe those most frequently used.
> (Hoey & Winter 86, p.135)

This is a view that would receive the full support of RST proponents. There are, however, I believe both similarities and difference in the way the link between grammar and discourse are viewed by Hoey and Winter and by Mann, Thompson and Matthiessen. Both would agree that the clause relation is not a grammatical relation. Matthiessen & Thompson write;

> A clause combination is organised like the rhetorical structure of a text, but it is not

here, but they do find an approximate 90% probability that the enhancing nucleus -satellite rhetorical relation will be coded in this way. The very fact that 10% are not so coded absolves them from the claim that their arguments are circular. In one out of ten instances the relation is not coded by its grammatical counterpart.

Assumption 8 The Importance of Purpose

This I think leads us to a major difference between RST and the work of Hoey and Winter. It also jumps us on to a consideration of Mann and Thompson's eighth assumption. (No's six and seven will be returned to in due course.) The assumption is firstly that text structuring relations are functional. There would be no disagreement here with Hoey and Winter. Mann and Thompson continue that the character of the relations can be stated in terms of the effects they produce and that these can be described 'in terms of the purposes of the writer, the writer's assumptions about the reader and certain propositional patterns in the subject matter of the text', Mann, Matthiessen & Thompson 92, p.45). I still do not find a fundamental difference between this and the semantic relations that Hoey and Winter look for. There is a change in emphasis however from a set of textual relations in Hoey and Winter's case, to the concern with purpose and writer's intentions, which RST confronts head on, as already described earlier in this chapter.

It is this fundamental attention to purpose that makes RST a suitable model of analysis to conduct genre analysis through. Genre as defined by Swales (Swales 1990 p.58) is `a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes'. Rhetorical structure theory provides a mechanism for discovering those purposes both through a nut and bolt analysis of the kind of relation entered into by each clause in a text, and from a more top down perspective in terms of the large scale and top level organisation patterns texts can be plausibly shown to have.

RST has done little in the field of genre analysis but its proponents often recognise its potential in the field. A potential that this thesis seeks to realise to some degree. It is the foregrounding of purpose in a text, and the relation between writer and reader or speaker and listener that each rhetorical structure embodies that supply RST with its genre analysis credentials. The clause relational approach of Hoey and Winter, because it is more linguistically grounded in lexico grammar and semantics, rather than semantics, pragmatics and rhetoric, is more suitable as a kind of text analysis that will reveal discourse patterns and text types rather than genres or socially situated activity types, which is the analytical aim of this work.

Hoey and Winter talk about `patterns of discourse organisation' Hoey & Winter 86, p.187) with little attention to genre. Patterns of problem solution are found in many types of text but their generic function is not addressed by their analysis. Hoey and Winter do not look at specific situations of discourse pattern occurrence in order to recognise typical genre specific functions realised by the patterns they have recognised. Admittedly, no RST work to date has done this, but I think the application of RST is more conducive to such a purpose because of its central concern with the purposes of the speaker or writer. In Hoey & Winter 86 they say that the relations they identify 'may in combination begin to form recognisable patterns' (Hoey & Winter 1986, p.130), and they cite the work of Rothery and Martin, who do focus on genre, to elaborate the point.

I think Martin's approach is more firmly based in grammar however, (see Martin 1991 for an example). Martin reaches a description of discourse from grammar. There is no problem with this but it is not what happens in either clause relational analysis or RST. The point is even clearer in a recent paper of Ventola's, (Ventola 1988). Here she perceives the need to develop the Martin style of discourse analysis she used in her doctoral thesis to account for similar text relations that I am using RST for. She finds Martin's grammatical approach to discourse too restrictive. Martin has the message as the basic unit of an exchange. This unit is defined in grammatical terms as a unit that selects independently for mood. This means that on reconsidering her service encounter data Ventola finds consecutive short statements produced by the same speaker needing to be coded as whole separate exchanges. She is looking for ways to capture the relation, the meaning relation between such adjacent utterances. This is very much what I am doing in using RST to code the relations between adjacent clauses and groups of clauses in the monologs. However, rather than use RST, Ventola looks for an answer within the systemic grammatical framework, and finds it by calling this relation 'the logical relation in exchanges', as opposed to the interpersonal relation that is realised by exchange structures. However she accounts for this logical relation using Halliday's grammar of the clause complex; of enhancement, elaboration and extension, (Halliday 1985, p.202-27). This covers or collapses most of the semantic type of relation in RST but ignores the rhetorical ones that are not straightforwardly realizable by using a conjunction.

The problem I think is of using grammar to uncover discourse features. As Hoey and Sinclair argue, to capture discourse patterns one needs a clause relational or discourse level of analysis which is something different to grammatical analysis. I think the relations in question for Ventola may be describable using the Hallidayan system, but it will account for the relations as grammatical units, whereas what is needed is to keep on the discourse stratum and to look at conjunction discoursally as having rhetorical and pragmatic function as well as semantic. In Ventola 1989 she praises the potential of RST as a genre tool. The questions she would like RST to answer are very much the starting point for the second half of this thesis.

> Do texts belonging to one text type have rhetorical structures which are characteristic only of that type.
> (Ventola 89, p.148)

I think the answer is that the way genre is realised and discoverable through an RST analysis will be more complicated than that. A preliminary answer will be attempted later in this chapter when I consider the value of Lemke's work in relation to my own.

Systemic approaches to discourse, although they recognise separate strata of realisation; phonological, lexicogrammatical and discoursal tend to push outwards in all directions from a nucleus of grammar. Both discourse and intonation are explained in terms of grammar, (see Halliday 1970 for his approach to intonation). Winter and Hoey make the claim that their analysis captures the right consideration of both the grammatical nature of text and its interactional nature.

> Those linguists who have made proper acknowledgement of the interactiveness of written discourse have sometimes lost sight of the effects of the grammar and the lexis of the discourse in their exploration of the way readers process discourses. . . One descriptive approach that has managed to sail successfully between the Scylla of discourse reification and the Charybdis of psychological speculation is that developed by Winter and his associates, normally referred to as CLAUSE RELATIONAL ANALYSIS.
> (Hoey and Winter 86, p.120)

If the fundamental difference in content between clause relations and RST is in terms of semantic relations rather than semantic and pragmatic ones, the fundamental difference in the way the analysis is performed is due to Hoey and Winter's great reliance on lexicogrammar to realise the relations. This is decidedly not the case for RST.

Hoey and Winter state that;

> The reader infers the semantic connection between the words using as evidence linguistic clues where available.
> (Hoey & Winter 86, p.121)

Whereas systemicists start from grammar and probe outward Hoey and Winter emphasise that what they are doing is discourse analysis. The patterns they identify are discourse patterns and not `quasi grammatical structures', (ibid, p.135). This aligns them with RST. They also see the relation between grammar and discourse in the same perspective as Mann and Thompson. It is decisions taken about `what relations to express' that `affects our grammatical choices', (ibid, p.125). This is clearly compatible with the Mann & Matthiessen hypothesis that clause combining in grammar has evolved as a grammaticalisation of rhetorical relations in discourse, (Matthiessen & Thompson 1989, p.301).

Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson, however, find counter examples; where the grammar missignals a rhetorical relation; where the nucleus of a rhetorical structure, for example, is encoded in the grammatical subordinate clause and the satellite in the main clause. This means that in RST, relations can be posited with no evidence from the lexicogrammar, indeed relations signalled by the grammar can be overruled by the analyst and a different rhetorical relation assigned to it than its grammar might suggest. Hoey and Winter state that `lexical and grammatical choices are tied inextricably to the semantic relations between sentences', (Hoey and Winter 1986, p.126). The fact that they recognise the possibility of multiple relations means that they accept the possibility of some relations not being signalled. These have to be inferenced as do even those that are signalled in some way.

For Hoey and Winter `the signalled relation is not a matter for doubt'. For them it is a core feature of their analytical method to use linguistic evidence wherever possible. For Mann and Thompson it is more of an ideological claim that separates their work from that of other text linguists. For this research the approach will be a pragmatic one. Where the lexico grammar aids the recognition of relations it will be used and appealed to. Where it doesn't, plausible analyses will be made in terms of the plausible intention of the speaker. I hypothesise that the semantic relations that Hoey and Winter work with will very largely be signalled, either by conjunction or by vocabulary 3 items (Winter 1982).

There is evidence in my RST sample analysis in Chapter 9 that conjunctions can missignal discourse relations. My findings so far are very much in line with Schiffrin's, (Schiffrin 1987). Discourse markers such as `so' have their lexical grammatical meaning or function on some occasions but on others they are used to signal only discourse relations; the movement from main point to minor point or from one section to another of the talk. A similar range of examples can be found in Kumpf 1986. It is only such examples that I have found so far and rhetorical structure analysis highlights the delexicalising of these words. The kind of signalling that I have no evidence of as being misleading, however, are the occurrence of vocabulary 3 items. These do seem reliable guides to types of clause relation in a text.

Assumption 6 The Importance of Relations

The remaining assumptions about RST made by Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson (1992) are less contentious. Assumption 6 is that the principal structural pattern in text is relational. They contrast this with seeing the structure as semantic. However as Lemke lucidly details (passim), semantics can be and should be a relational issue. In the sense that Hasan and Lemke employ the term semantics, I do not think RST would wish to exclude itself. They also contrast their approach with rank scale structural models which are `analogous to the mechanisms of certain grammars', (Mann, Matthiessen & Thompson 1992, p.44).

For me the benefit of using RST in conjunction with discourse analysis is that it adds a relational semantic analysis of text to sequential functional analysis. These analyses are complementary. They can both be applied to the texts that constitute my data and applied to different chunks. RST is being used on monolog and the sequential patterning is being applied to the dialogue that the monologs form part of.

Assumption 7 Asymmetry of Relations

The seventh assumption refers to asymmetry of relations; the nucleus - satellite pattern of relation as realised in RST. Mann, Matthiessen and Thompson acknowledge that this is a feature of many other kinds of text analysis too, notably van Dijk 77, Longacre 83 and Meyer 92. It is not a feature of the discourse patterns recognised by Hoey and Winter however. Indeed it can be problematic that the Solutionhood relation in RST which is similar to the Problem - Solution pattern in clause relations should have to have a Solutionhood nucleus. I can see no reason why some texts should not have a Problemhood relation, where that is foregrounded, occupies most of the text and where the offered solution is minimal or without weight. There are examples in the data of this thesis that could be so coded. Given that the nuclei of the relations in a text should produce a coherent summary, it is hard to see how this would be the case if the situation outlined above should hold. This is a practical problem rather than a theoretical one, and will be dealt with as it arises in the analysis chapters to follow. RST, it is always claimed, isn't meant to be a rigid system; if a Problemhood relation is necessary it will be supplied.

Assumption 9 A Small Set of Recurrent Relations

The final assumption, number nine, concerns the number of relations in RST. It states that the set of relations is open but that additions should not frequently be needed. They suggest that

> ...text in a culture can be analysed virtually entirely in terms of a small set of highly recurrent relations, the knowledge of which is shared in the culture.
> (Mann, Matthiessen & Thompson 92, p.46)

Viewed from a genre perspective this statement can be refocussed to produce the working hypothesis that drives this work. Members of specific cultures, be they corporate or professional or activity specific, can be expected to produce texts with a small set of recurrent relations. One might expect that the top level relations will be fewer and more regular than one would find over a cross section of text types. One would expect that not only is knowledge of these relations shared in the culture but that the analyst, making plausible relation judgements, which are regularly supported by co- occurrence in similar types of text in similar sequential positions, will be able to access the culture and the genres at its disposal for constituting the texts that are the working practices and processes of that culture.

8.6 Analysing Monolog

RST Text Generation and Flowcharts

Rhetorical Structure Theory was originally developed as a tool for text generation, 'specifically for planning diverse texts of different kinds', (Mann & Thompson 1986, p.85). This kind of application of RST is I think quite compatible with my attempts in Chapter 7 to produce flow charts to account for participant choice in briefing and draft review activity. These flow charts were constructed on the basis of discourse analysis. They had the benefit, I believe, of showing structures of social action in a different way to the discourse analysis of obligatory and optional elements occurring in relatively fixed sequence.

Now I am focusing on technical writing texts, and I find what appear to be the same genres unfolding, to constitute the document design process, in this different professional field. The unfolding process, however, is on the surface at least, from a discoursal perspective, quite different. Put basically, public relations makes more use of dialogue, and technical writing more use of monolog. This is one basic justification for the application of RST. RST will let me analyse the bulk of the technical writing data that is chunked in monologic units. I am hypothesising that rhetorical features of text will be foregrounded by using RST. It may well be that the rhetorical aspects of the activity are foregrounded by conducting it in monologic mode. One possible reason for the change of mode is the reduction in the degree of shared knowledge between the participants. A possible consequence of this change is a making explicit of the rhetoric of the communication processes. The dialogic texts, analysed using discourse analysis, reveal patterns of sequential organisation that can be used by the participants for getting the job done, and the rhetoric is backgrounded, a shared set of knowledge and beliefs. What the analysis must aim to do then is discover typical rhetorical patterns of organization, through RST, in the technical writing texts, and see at what points in the interaction these monologic structures occur, and the typical functions they fulfil. Conversely, the clear discourse structures of the public relations texts need to be examined for signs of an orientation to the same or a similar rhetoric that is manifested in the technical writing material.

The production of flow charts, accessible through both discourse analysis and RST (Mann & Thompson 1986) is one of the potential sites for doing this job. Discourse analytic flow charts emphasise a range of choices available at any given point in the talk and the range of possible or likely responses to whatever choice is made. They presently account for the nature of the information flow. RST flow charts, judging from the single example in Mann & Thompson 1986 p.92 are likely to account less for information based aspects of the communication, and rather to highlight pragmatic aspects of the communication process.

Information Based Relations and Presentational Relations

In Mann, Matthiessen & Thompson 1992, part of the core justification for RST is that

> In research, a great deal of misunderstanding and misrepresentation in language has come from assuming that the sole or principle function of language is informing, and that it therefore operates as a message passing medium, a code... [this] does not stand up to careful examination.
> (Mann, Matthiessen & Thompson 92, p.45)

They claim that language has a wide range of other functions which can be presentational or social with little informative value. This is highlighted in Mann and Thompson 1988. Here they offer possible ways of breaking down their set of twenty or so relations into a taxonomy. The two group headings are `subject matter' and `presentational', (ibid, p.257). The presentational relations are Motivation, Antithesis, Background, Enablement, Evidence, Justify and Concession. The same kind of distinction is made in Matthiessen and Thompson

1989, p.297-8. Here the taxonomy is of relations dealing with `rhetorical acts' and those concerned with `subject matter'. Examples given of the former group are Motivation, Solutionhood and Antithesis. The second group is subdivided into Elaborating and Enhancing relations. This confirms the link between the kinds of relation in this group and those covered in Halliday's grammar (Halliday 1985), where the same names are given to types of clause combination.

This split into subject matter and presentational relations, matching a semantic - pragmatic split, is appositely worded for the purposes of this thesis. Subject matter and presentation can usefully be seen as the basic elements of briefing, draft reviewing and presentation. All three are concerned in different ways with providing accurate subject matter information, and equally, with the way to present it. The general RST analysis chapter confirms that presentational relations regularly occur in both briefings and draft checks and that they occur at high levels in the rhetorical organisation of text. This is in keeping with Matthiessen and Thompson's general claim that presentational relations are `scale insensitive' (Matthiessen & Thompson 1989, p.298). That is to say that they may occur at any level in a text, whereas the enhancing relations are likely not to occur at the top levels of rhetorical structure. They further specify that a likely context for what they call `rhetorical act relations' is when a request, offer or claim is being made. Thus they provide a route of access for viewing semantic relations in a context of speech acts, which is to be a central feature of this analysis.

The coming analysis will show how productive of results the RST technique is when dealing with such high level relations as Enablement and Motivation. In Hoey & Winter 86 there is a sample text where `motivation' occurs as a vocabulary 3 item. Hoey and Winter suggest, quite reasonably, that this should lead readers to expect answers to the question `What for?', (Hoey & Winter 1986, p.128). A related but much more common high level presentational relation in this data is Enablement. One might predict that the question Hoey and Winter would suggest that the listener would expect to have answered here is `how?'. These questions seem far more suited to providing logical or semantic relations; by giving means, or reasons or a sequence of instructions. They do not capture presentational aspects of the text, they are focussed too narrowly on information. Jordan, a former colleague of Winter and Hoey, states;

> Basic relations such as Cause, Purpose, Means and Basis are relatively easy to identify and explain. . . However listeners do not always wish to wait politely for an opening to ask for a relation based on information just presented . . . they ask more complex questions containing information that may be assumed to be known but which has not been mentioned overtly in the text.
> (Jordan 88, p.287)

Jordan suggests that such questions need to be asked in two parts, but I think a switch to a rhetorical structure approach would pay dividends here too. If issues are coming up in a text which do not relate directly back to items already mentioned but refer to mutual assumed knowledge then RST, seeking plausible relations, and not relying on textual evidence, may be a suitable means of recognising complex informational and rhetorical structuring in text. This is compounded by RST's dedication to hierarchical structure; showing how clause relations are embedded within other clause relations and build up to and / or down from top level organising structural relations.

In dealing with spoken text, which neither Hoey, Winter nor Mann & Thompson do to any extent, one has the interaction itself at one's disposal to see how the combination of information and rhetoric is received by the listener. Often we do not need to invent questions, the listener asks them for himself. Examples are to be found in the RST general analysis of Tape 7 in Chapter 9.

In spoken interaction questions actually are often asked by listeners. This and their other verbal activities, seeking clarification, giving feedback etc give an interactional angle on how the monologic text has been received. The next turn from the monolog producer can also reveal that the recipient of the monolog has taken it in the manner it was meant. There is a good example of this kind of interaction also in the general RST analysis for Tape 7. Questions and other responses form an ongoing part of the interaction and allow discourse analysis to gauge how what occurs in the monologs receives uptake. For monolog, where other forms of clause relational analysis or RST could have been applied to discover the semantic structuring of the text, RST has been chosen for this data because it reveals both semantic and pragmatic structuring. Additionally, I see more point in trying to account for the speaker's strategies in producing these lengthy pieces of talk than in guessing what questions the listener might be or could be constructing, when the listener himself can and often does construct those questions at suitable points, and which then become available for a discourse analytical approach to the text.

8.7 RST Work on Spoken Data

To my knowledge there are only two doctoral theses that use RST to conduct analyses of spoken text. These are the work of Kumpf (1986) and Stewart (1987). This seems a small product in the light of Mann & Thompson's repeated calls for an application of RST beyond the bounds of written monolog. Both theses deal with spoken language as it occurs as monolog. To this extent there is a strong connection between this work and my own. Neither thesis, however, considers the interactive setting within which these monologs occurred. Neither of them report on the context of situation or culture of these monologs. This means there is no background information about the communicative event taking place (Hymes 1974), nor is any co-text provided. The surrounding text has been removed and the monologs analysed in isolation. This is a shame as in both cases the context is quite exotic. Kumpf is looking at interlanguage narratives produced by intermediate language learners from Japanese and Spanish backgrounds and Stewart's work in on the discoursal functions of a local language of Peru, Conchucos Quechua. Both theses make use of the concept of genre, but, disappointingly, neither of them add anything new to it by the application of RST.

Kumpf and Stewart

Both theses have been most useful to me as provision of practice material for analysing spoken language using RST; especially as both have had supervisory contact with Mann and / or Thompson. Kumpf writes in Chapter 2 of her thesis;

> It should be evident that spontaneous and interactive discourse, particularly conversation, commonly employ unexpressed relational propositions.
> (Kumpf 86, p.30)

This is a striking feature when one transfers RST from the short well formed texts that Mann & Thompson and Fox use to the impromptu context of talk. Relations do seem less 'expressed'; that is, not lexically or grammatically marked. The availability of a large amount of analysed data was therefore of great help on my learning curve for doing RST analysis.

The purpose of Kumpf's work is to throw light on grammatical features of text; to show cohesion and coherence in the language use of non natives. In particular Kumpf shows the kinds of relation that learners make with simple conjunctions such as AND, BUT, and SO. She highlights the fact that the discourse relations that are marked are not always what would be being signalled by natives. All the data Kumpf deals with are narratives. In none of the data do we see speech produced by more than one participant, although we are told there was always an audience of fellow students and usually a teacher. From the Ph.D we learn what kinds of discourse relation are commonly encoded by these Japanese and Spanish speakers when they tell stories. We learn what discoursal use they most commonly put simple conjunctions to. What we do not learn is anything new about the single genre or text type that provides the corpus for the study; narrative. As with the work of Mann & Thompson generally, genre is a given unit on which to practise RST. The outcomes of this practice have implications for discourse and grammar, and the interrelation between the two, but not for genre analysis.

Kumpf uses Labov and Waletzky's (1967) analytical method for recognising different elements in the narrative genre. These are then applied to all the data as a starting point for the RST application. The genre analysis gives the author her bearings for where to make high level organisation divisions in her data. She doesn't use RST to discover this chunking, or even as an alternative method of gaining access to the rhetorical organisation of narrative. The RST analysis is only applied within known genre elements and no effort is made to account for links between genre elements using RST. The difference in the kinds of links one might expect within genre elements and between genre elements is taken up by Lemke (1988) and will be returned to in the next analytical chapter.

There is no attempt either to show common high level rhetorical relations that commonly hold in one part of narrative or another. There is no focus on the different variations in rhetorical organisation that were displayed by speakers from different cultural background. In short, genre was taken as a given, a demarcated site for analysis and the products of the analysis were all focussed downwards, on ways of signalling discourse relations through grammar.

Stewart's work has some of the same limitations for a genre enthusiast as Kumpf's, but it does look at texts from a range of genres and comment on commonly occurring high level patterns of organisation that are displayed through RST. Her work is organised on the principle that 'different discourse types may well have different organising principles'. (Stewart 87, p.97). She also recognises that rhetorical relations in a text may `play a role in defining discourse type, (ibid, p.103).

Her approach to genre is one that pays attention to the communicative context in a Hallidayan or Hymesian sense. It is however firmly grounded in the text type approaches of Longacre, Beekman & Callow and Werlich. These are top down approaches to genre. They focus less on the dynamic aspects of text, on a sequence of obligatory and optional functional elements co occurring to constitute a kind of social activity, and more on a general categorisation in terms of purpose. For example, according to Werlich (1976), the Descriptive text type focuses on 'factual phenomena', the Narrative text type on 'factual and/or conceptual phenomena, and Expository texts focus on the `constituent elements of concepts of phenomena' and so on. To me this is a rather abstract kind of text typology that is not paying sufficient attention to the contexts in which these basic patterns of text occur. For me it is at this lower level that genre can most usefully be identified. It is the what comes before and what comes after parameters that play a key role in determining genre. Once again this is a borrowing from Lemke, of whom more later. Stewart recognises that these categories are not clear cut but concludes that

> they reflect the dominant speaker goals in constructing the discourse, and are thus adequate for a reasonable analysis of discourse organisation ...
> (Stewart 87, p.105)

Stewart, Like Kumpf, has used an existent theory of genre to preclassify her texts for analysis. Kumpf, however, carries preclassification of genre elements over into her RST analysis. Additionally, she only uses one genre of text which gives her no room for comparison or contrast of the rhetorical structure of the genre. To be fair, this is not her interest; her thesis is a discourse approach to grammar. Even the short quotes above however show that Stewart is concerned with how different text types are rhetorically organised and what contribution RST can make to a fuller understanding of these various patterns of organisation.

In her thesis she offers an RST analysis of three types of non narrative texts; expository, motivational and expressive. The analysis is always of discoursal features that belong to these types or genres and the way that these features are expressed in terms of rhetorical relations. It is Stewart who makes the albeit obvious point that the rhetorical relations most essential to a text's coherence are likely to be found in the higher levels of the text's organisation, (ibid, p 128). She identifies relations that occur only in low and only in higher echelons of the rhetorical structure of her text types. This is a pattern of analysis that I want to develop, use as a starting point in the next chapter. She also uses RST as a way of recognising major structural boundaries in her texts, in contrast to Kumpf, who drew her boundaries, and only performed RST analysis on these predefined units.

In the analysis of her advice text, the closest to my own data, though still light years distant, she asserts that

> . . . the relative priorities of the goals of the text are reflected in the hierarchical organisation of the rhetorical structure. (ibid, p.179)

She finds Solutionhood as the top level organising relation with Motivation, Restatement and Background at the next level, not a dissimilar pattern to those in some of my monologs. What Stewart appears to have no access to, probably because this data was part of ongoing everyday life in a Peruvian village, is the text or action that provoked these monologs and the responses that were provoked by them. To this extent the analysis is only of text types, albeit of texts that appear to be bound up in ongoing social activity. The lack of context makes it difficult to see the function of these monologs within larger genres of social interaction. In contrast, my own data has monologs within an ongoing context of document design, which makes it possible to view them as structural elements of genres of social action, rather than as text types, cut off from their causes and effects and their sequential placement.

Another useful feature of Stewart's work is the relational typology she develops. So far I have only outlined Mann & Thompson's two part taxonomy of relations as subject matter or presentational, mirroring Ford's suggestion (Ford 1987) of semantic and pragmatic. Stewart develops this quite considerably. She has 9 parameters for classifying types of relations. These are not mutually exclusive but some should prove of use in exploring generic features of rhetorical relations. Her list is as follows.

> Parameter 1: Multi Nuclear vs Nucleus - Satellite
> Parameter 2: Oppositional vs Non Oppositional
> Parameter 3: Elaborating vs Non Elaborating
> Parameter 4: Contingent vs Non Contingent
> Parameter 5. Closure vs Non Closure
> Parameter 6. Causal vs Non Causal
> Parameter 7. Evaluative vs Non Evaluative
> Parameter 8. Change Provoking vs Non Change Provoking
> Parameter 9. Extra Hierarchical vs Hierarchical
> (ibid, p.259)

Parameter 1 identifies those relations that are between equal and non equal parts. No 2 identifies relations that are likely to be found in argumentative or persuasive texts. Parameter 3 highlights those nucleus - satellite relations that add detail to the nuclear portion. No 4 groups those relations that handle logical or temporal relations. No 5 identifies relations that can realise closure. No 6 deals with relations concerned with cause. No 7 identifies another set of relations that might be expected in argumentative texts. No 8 identifies those relations that would probably occur in persuasive texts. Finally, no 9 recognises that in spoken language there are relations that do not enter into the hierarchy of the text at all.

I feel that this is a useful list upon which to develop a generic study of text using RST. Other parameters may be identifiable which are genre specific, or one could look to make more delicate subclassifications in terms of types of relations occurring with one or more other types. This will be pursued in the following chapter. I feel that Stewart could have developed this part of her thesis more but in fairness she was limited by only analysing one text from any of her set of text types, so although she looked to RST to identify generic features in her texts, she would have been hard pressed to make too many generalisations about what types of relation are likely to occur or co-occur and at what place in the hierarchy from such a limited corpus. Again, in fairness, her aims were only partly projected upwards from discourse to genre. A substantial part of her thesis deals with the discoursal occurrence of grammatical features common in Conchucos Quechua.

There is also a chapter in the thesis on narrative which is interesting because it illustrates how RST can be genre sensitive. Stewart finds that she needs some different relations to those used for the non narrative texts, such as Sequence and Joint, and is able to drop some that were useful for non narrative such as Motivation and Antithesis. Clearly, on the basis of one, albeit long narrative, one cannot make rhetorical structure genre claims. One can well imagine finding both Antithesis and Motivation in narrative texts. Such narratives would however be quite different to the folk story type narrative in Stewart's data. This should alert us to the fact that monolithic genres such as narrative are probably too broad to show a regular pattern of rhetorical structure, beyond the obvious occurrence of sequential relations. One would need to sub specify narrative, ideally in terms of its social setting; its context, its co-text and its function, and then regular patterns of rhetorical relation might appear that were being frequently used by a limited range of type of participant in order to achieve a restricted range of culturally available goal. This range of limitations is a feature of my own genre analysis into the types of interaction that constitute the working practices of technical writers and public relations officers when involved in document design. It is for this reason that I believe real advances in the projection of RST upwards, as a genre recognising tool, can be made within this thesis.

Stewart's conclusion is also favourable for using RST in genre analysis.

> Rhetorical Structure Analysis is thus a very effective tool for <u>defining</u> prototypical genres... Choice of genre does ... set the stage for the preference of certain rhetorical relations and particular hierarchical orderings of these relations.
> (ibid, p.344)

She is correct, I believe, to label such genres as narrative and exposition `prototypical'. She is also correct to say that

> it is these choices (of rhetorical relation), rather than the choice of an abstract genre that influence the choices of particular combinations.
> (ibid, p.344)

If, however, one moves closer to genres that are embedded in real social activities, then I believe that genre stops being an abstract concept and can be seen, partly through the clause combination choices regularly made by its participants, as a way of enacting regularly occurring types of social or professional activity. This is the research site that the next two Chapters will excavate.

Stewart's thesis and Kumpf's are the first to apply RST to speech. Stewart's is the first that seeks to use RST as a tool for genre analysis. So far the foundations are only half dug for a genre based study of interaction. Stewart suggests that work on clause combining be linked with Ethnomethodology and conversation analysis, (ibid, p.351-2). For reasons which have been laid out in Chapter 1 of this thesis I think this is a mistaken notion, and that RST needs links with Discourse Analysis because of the common analytic perspective they share.

8.8 Non Sequential Semantically Oriented Approaches to Genre and Text Relations

Jay Lemke

It is in the work of Jay Lemke, with support from Ruqaiya Hasan, that I find the clearest theoretical support for the kind of research I am doing in Part 2 of this thesis; coupling together rhetorical structure theory and discourse analysis with the intention of discovering features that interrelate texts. Lemke is a social semiotician. If one can place systemic linguistics as working outwards from a grammatical centre, and RST, up till now, largely working downwards from discourse to grammar, offering discourse level explanations for grammatical features of languages, then Lemke is working upwards from discourse to the global concerns of language. These include ideology, intertextuality and social semiotics.

Not every aspect of Lemke's work need be discussed here. I will confine this text firstly to what Lemke has written that helps create the research space in which I am working with Rhetorical Structure Theory. Secondly I will discuss aspects of his work that make relations with the wider interests of this thesis, the context of culture of the document design professions. Thirdly I will briefly summarise the work of another researcher, Florence Davies, whose analytical methods and conceptual approaches interface with Lemke's and are also to be applied in this thesis.

In Relation to RST: Activity Structures and Thematic Formations

A central concern of Lemke's work is the need to establish ways in which texts interrelate. It is on this global plane of intertextuality that his work is grounded. For him, the task that a social semiotician should address comes in three interrelated parts. Firstly to 'abstract across occasions of use the paradigmatic options of what may be meant'. Secondly, to 'identify the characteristic co-patternings of lexicogrammatical choices and contextual configurations'. Thirdly, to 'represent the intertextual affinities a text has to the regular discourse patterns of its community', (Lemke 1988a, p.29). These goals are continuously being addressed in Lemke's work and each of them is a description of a strand of my own research. The first captures my discourse analytic approach to genre; my aim of recognising which genre elements occur in different parts of the document design process and what choices are available as the activity unfolds. The second is the area I am addressing through rhetorical structure theory. Lemke's contribution to the shape of this research will be discussed in this chapter. The third goal alerts me to other relations that might exist between the texts I am analysing, other than those of genre. There should be strong intertextual ties between texts that constitute different stages of the same document design process. The different texts that make up the Birmingham brochure design process [Tapes 4a, 4b, 5, 11, 15] and the two technical writing texts sited at Olympic Resources Ltd [Tapes 7, 12] are related in terms of participants and goal. They belong to different genres because they represent different stages of the process. There must be linguistic ways of showing this relation, which I aim to illustrate using an RST analytical framework.

A core feature of Lemke's work, then, is his analytical approach to meaning in terms of relations. Whole texts mean because of the relations they have with other texts. Intertextuality means we always interpret one text in the light of others that are in some ways similar to it. This is a global adaptation of clause relations and RST. It is this global perspective that gives RST its genre analysis credentials. The kind of rhetorical relations found in one sample text of a genre should co-exist in other sample texts and, in part at least, account for what the generic features are that group these texts together. In addition, texts that have a non generic intertextual tie, the two technical writing texts for example, should also share some relations. Again, it is the aim of this analysis to access their nature and their scope through Rhetorical Structure Theory.

There are two kinds of ties that Lemke posits as existing between different texts; co-actional and co thematic. In Lemke 1988a he defines these two as follows. Co-actional ties are those which are 'linking texts that belong to parts of the same larger social activity'. These then are the kinds of link that should exist between non generically related texts. Co-thematic ties are those which are 'joining texts which speak of the same things in the same manner', (Lemke 1988, p.30). These are the sort of ties one would expect to find in texts of the same genre.

Lemke lists four textual linguistic resources that he thinks will be most helpful for constructing intertextual ties between texts. These are lexical semantics, interpersonal systems, clause complexing semantics and text structural relations. Only two of these are being directly harnessed in this research.

Clause complexing semantics is another term for clause relational analysis or RST. By text structural relations Lemke is referring to Hasan's work on genre structure potential, GSP (Hasan 1984 & 1985), which has close affinities with the discourse analytic approach taken here. Interpersonal systems, such as polarity and modality are not focussed on in this work. Nevertheless, the discourse analysis coding of the interaction is an interpersonal system, even if the emphasis in this research is on its textual function; realising genre elements. Lexical semantics is the system which Lemke, Hasan (1985) and Hoey (1991) all use to discover semantic structure rather than sequential structure in text. RST can access these text semantic features, in a way of particularly high value in this thesis, because of its interface value with the discourse approach developed in Part One of this thesis.

Genre and Rhetorical Structure

Lemke makes a distinction between what has traditionally been seen as genre and what he calls <u>activity structure</u>. Genre is akin to the abstract macro text patterns of Longacre and others, which have then been used as the basis for classifying texts on which to perform RST by Mann & Thompson and Kumpf and Stewart. By activity type Lemke means a pattern of social action. This is very much what I mean by genre, (and the Sydney school). Lemke defines activity structure as follows.

> An <u>activity structure</u> is a socially recognisable sequence of actions.
> (Lemke 90a, p.198)

A more detailed definition occurs in Lemke 1988b.

> Activity structures are characteristic of a community. They are regular, repeatable and repeated sequences of context dependent options for the organisation of meaningful actions into socially recognisable events or situation types.
> (Lemke 88b, p.158)

It is a structure that consists of elements which are functional. Examples from his work on teaching science include Going Over Homework, Student Teacher Debates and Admonition Sequences. These are recognisable sequences of actions that regularly occur in the science classroom. Importantly for my own views on genre, Lemke says the focus is on activity, which may or may not be coded by the language semiotic, rather than on language per se. He writes;

> The same activity type can be realised in many ways, by many actual sequences of actions.
> (Lemke 90a, p.198)

The repercussions of such a position put semantics and function in the driving seat of genre analysis. It means that no one particular lexicogrammatical string, or speech act, or set of speech acts can be defined as a genre element. The genre element has to be defined functionally. Lemke's examples, again from the classroom, are Student Challenge or Teacher Question. This is good justification for the less rigid approach I take and Lemke takes to coding stretches of discourse. If no one linguistic element such as a clause or an exchange or an adjacency pair can once and for all be seen as the unit for genre then one's coding needs to be more relaxed and able to deal with different sizes and types of text that stand as a functional element. They may be a clause in length, as in some of the dialogic decision making texts or they may be fifty linked clauses of monolog long which first need to be interpreted as having an internal semantic organisation of their own.

There are many ways in which these functional elements can be coded in language. This is what I find, comparing the monologic enactment of the draft review in technical writing with the dialogic equivalent in the public relations data. Different encoding does not necessarily mean a different genre; it may reflect different strategies on the part of the encoder and this is part of what I hope to discover using RST. By revealing the semantic features of the monolog I can then assign functional elements to them as they work to fill a slot or part of a slot in the larger interactional framework. In this way a comparison of the different types of data is possible that will be a test of genre membership.

Lemke also insists that the converse position is also true. Namely that the same pattern of speech acts or clauses can realise quite different genre elements. It is the context that determines the function that an exchange or a stretch of text has.

> The meaning of any action is a function of the relations we construct for it to other actions thereby making them its contexts. Typical contextualisations are made in a community by

> means of its typical activity structures . . .
> (Lemke 88b, p.163)

Lemke says that his view of genre is different even from the Sydney school approach in the emphasis he puts on semantics. For Lemke, as the above quote on context shows, semantics is always relational. Meanings are made by relating one piece of text to another, either in local proximity, which accounts for textuality or across text boundaries, which is the semiotic system of intertextuality. Clearly, text analysis and intertextual analysis using a clause and whole message relation approach such as RST is going to be compatible with the global approach to genre and text relations taken by Lemke.

Concerning genre, in addition to a focus on the occurrence of obligatory and optional elements found in the work of Hasan in particular, Lemke himself puts more emphasis on

> ... the relations that must be construed between elements (pairwise or otherwise) for them to count as being those elements. That is in what SEMANTIC relation must we construe the realizations of two elements in order for us to be able to make them fit the pattern of the structural formula of elements?
> (Lemke 88b, p.161)

This, I believe, can be interpreted as what is happening in this research by the addition of RST to discourse analysis. Discourse analysis revealed the structural sequence of obligatory and optional elements that, at least in a dialogic mode, constitute the interactive options open to participants in order to complete necessary stages of the document design process. What RST now allows me to do, especially by focusing on less interactive and more monologically structured discourse, is to see the semantic relations that are necessary in order for a piece of text to count as part of or all of a genre element. This is to reinterpret Lemke somewhat as he sees a rhetorical structure approach slightly differently.

Semantic Relations

The kind of semantic relations he sees as a necessary addition to the Sydney School approach to genre are to be found in structures that Lemke calls '<u>thematic formations</u>'. These are non sequential aspects of text structure that Lemke uses lexical semantics to access. Lemke describes these as follows.

> Patterns of semantic relations among the same or closely related words and phrases are regularly repeated over and over again in many texts in a given community. These patterns I have called THEMATIC FORMATIONS.
> (Lemke 88b, p.165)

What he is suggesting is that we construct the same limited range of semantic relations between co-occurring lexical items, and that the pattern of these relations will co-occur in other texts of the same kind. It can sound very abstruse but in fact I think it is only a complicated way of getting at something obvious and commonsensical. Hasan (1985) provides the linguistic nuts and bolts, I think, for Lemke's conceptualisations.

R. Hasan

In Hasan 1985 she develops her notion of text unity as having two strands; structure and texture. Structure is very much what Lemke means by activity structure. This is the unfolding of obligatory and optional generic elements, defined functionally to produce types of text. Texture on the other hand is a matter of lexical and grammatical cohesion and the kind of relations that hold between stretches of text that are cohesive in this way. Texture then is concerned with the meaning relations that hold between parts of text which are non sequential. Put this way it sounds to me very much as if RST could be a means of accessing texture in a text. Neither Lemke nor Hasan do apply clause relations to this purpose however, they use lexical semantics. Hasan looks for grammatical cohesion coupled with lexical cohesion, (see Halliday & Hasan 1985, p.82 for a detailed description). In this text she does say that a third kind of cohesion is provided by `organic relations', and she gives the examples of conjunctives and adjacency pairs, but in the analysis that follows this aspect is not developed. It will be developed here, however, as this suggests that texture, or what Lemke calls thematic formations are not only revealed through lexicogrammatical cohesive devices but also through both the kinds of relations that RST illustrates, and the kinds of adjacency pairing that discourse analysis produces.

Hasan's lexical analysis is a little more elaborate than I have described it so far. The presence of cohesion alone is not enough to guarantee texture. First, Hasan seeks to identify chains of relation through a text. These similarity chains she claims are likely to be genre specific, highlighting ideational features of the text in question. What is needed, however, to assure this generic quality is what Hasan calls 'chain interaction'. This is equivalent to Lemke's concept of thematic formation. A chain interaction involves seeing a regular pattern of connection from one similarity chain to another. Hasan defines it as follows.

> A minimum requirement for chain interaction is that at least two members of one chain should stand in the same relation to two members of another chain.
> (ibid, p.91)

This then provides a semantic, non sequential approach to genre which is what Lemke wants adding to the Sydney school work. I have already criticised Ventola's work, which is very much built on Jim Martin's theories, because it lacks a strong semantic base. The service encounter genre she analysed showed strong generic features as a sequential unfolding process but, as I suggested in Chapter 3, perhaps because it is semantically weak as an activity, non sequential features of the genre were harder to identify.

The rationale underpinning this semantic approach is shared by Lemke and Hasan. It will be investigated in this thesis by means of RST rather than lexical semantics. It is that

> in a coherent text one says similar kinds of things about similar phenomena
> (ibid, p.92)

Put another way

> . . . when speakers are engaged in the process of creating coherent text, they stay with the same and similar things long enough to show how similar the states of affairs are in which these same and similar things are implicated.
> (ibid, p.92)

This is taken up very strongly by Lemke 1990a to show that whether one is doing the same genre or not there are a severely restricted number of ways of relating units of scientific talk. In the classroom, students then, have to learn both the activity structures of the classroom through which learning takes place, and also they have to learn to handle the semantic relations that hold between lexical strings in the field of science. This is a point I will return to when I consider Lemke's contribution to my understanding of how technical writing and public relations talk function in a macro sense.

Lemke on Rhetorical Structure

Lemke does not use rhetorical structure theory to access a text's thematic formations, its regularly occurring semantic structures. He sees the application of rhetorical structure theory as a means of discovering what he calls `rhetorical structures' in text. These are units that, in Lemke's description, construct the sequential nature of an activity structure rather than its thematic formations. Viewed as a sequential structure Lemke sees a loosely structured set of levels at which an activity structure can be analyzed. These are:

GENRE
FUNCTIONAL ELEMENTS
RHETORICAL STRUCTURES
GRAMMATICAL CONSTRUCTIONS AND WORDS
(Lemke 90a, p.201)

It is the functional elements in a regular sequence that realise genre. Beneath this Lemke has the functional elements realised by rhetorical structures, which are themselves realised by the lexicogrammar. So far this is in accord with my own view of the rhetorical relations (Mann & Thompson), such as I discover in the monologs, being analyzable both for their internal structure, and then as a functional element of the unfolding interaction.

Although Lemke cites Mann & Thompson on occasion, when describing his rhetorical structures, he defines them somewhat differently as;

> multivariate regular functional sequences of speech acts which can realise elements of more than one genre structure
> (Lemke 88b, p.164)

Multivariate is used in a Hallidayan sense (Halliday 1985), and is used in this context to suggest a linear sequence of units occurring with the possibility of recursion but which is something completable. It emphasises the sequential and segmental aspects of genre. What Lemke is doing here is stressing how regularly occurring units of language take on genre characteristics because of their contexts of occurrence, because of the type of relations they enter into with the surrounding text.

On another occasion, Lemke 1990a, the examples of rhetorical structures that he gives are Question - Answer patterns, Problem - Solution, Cause - Consequence, and Generalisation - Example. These are basic semantic relational patterns. Rhetorical structures then, for Lemke, may be regularly occurring sequences of speech acts, such as those that constitute a teaching exchange in the classroom, or they can be commonly occurring sets of semantic relations, such as problem - solution which are discourse patterns that can fit many genres. The notion is of regularly occurring pattern of text that are themselves non generic, but which may be put to a functional generic use in particular types of text.

I can agree with this but I believe in addition that the analysis of rhetorical relations in a text can be a means of discovering a text's semantic value, its thematic formations. In this way rhetorical structure analysis, because it is grounded in semantic relations can both add to one's understanding of genre as an unfolding sequential structure and to a concept of genre as a set of regularly occurring semantic relations.

As Lemke expects to find and does find a common set of relations that make up the thematics of science, so I expect to find the equivalent for public relations and technical writing. The research question to be added to my concerns about genre in the following RST Genre Analysis chapter is are there typical semantic relations that the public relations texts enter into that are different from those of the technical writing texts? Thus in addition to seeking generic relations across the two activity fields I am looking for intertextual relations, especially between those texts that make up different stages of the same document design process, and I am looking for differences that may be explicable in terms of the different rhetorics of public relations and technical writing.

Hasan and Lemke's semantic approach to genre should be a way of accessing its ideational component. It should show the typical relations that hold between the regularly occurring lexical items or lexically related items. These relations Hasan calls 'semantic groupings', Hasan 85, p.85). She states that these groupings should be genre specific. Within a known specific social process there should be a predictable set of relations that constitute the field of activity. I expect some of these ideational relations to be made apparent by rhetorical structure theory. It isn't just the lexical patterning that reveals the field of discourse. Analysis of the kind of rhetorical relations in the texts of the social process in question, and more particularly, the units that these relations actually hold between, what is being referenced in relation to what, should perform a similar function.

Hasan says that one of the benefits of her kind of analysis is that it highlights 'multifunctionality' in texts, (ibid, p.94). Her analysis links the textual function of cohesion and reference, by emphasising their semantic nature, to the ideational function of text, its subject matter. She calls for more research that

> [brings] the logical and interpersonal functions into the picture. If this can be done it will show that even where text is concerned, multifunctionality is a fruitful concept.
> (ibid, p.94)

It is primarily this logical function that is accessed by RST, the basic conjunctive type of relation. I think however that because RST also has a pragmatic, rhetorical side, it has an interpersonal element too. In addition to handling basic semantic relations such as cause, condition and time, it also handles relations such as Antithesis, Motivation and Evidence which must be seen as relations holding between the participants of a text. These relations trace the expectations a speaker has in talking to someone and his plausible reasons for talking in the first place. This coupled with the discourse analytic approach which as I have already outlined, has both interpersonal and textual function, gives this research a claim to being a properly multifunctional approach to genre analysis.

Hasan explains why the lexical relations she describes should hold, in terms of people staying

> with the same and similar things long enough to show how similar the states of affairs are in which these same and similar things are implicated.
> (ibid, p.94)

Hasan's work, along with the parallel claims made by Lemke for teaching science; that it is about learning to recognise the relatively few kinds of relation which regularly hold between constituents of the subject matter, have implications, I believe, for the way that aspects of the document design processes can be viewed from both linguistic and rhetorical perspectives. It means that one can view the activity of briefing as acquainting the text writer or designer with the typical semantic structures or thematic formations of the client company. The technical writer, public relations officer, and the designer all need to know what meanings are important to the consultant company and what relations these meanings typically enter into. Taken one step further, viewed rhetorically, both public relations and technical writing can be seen as activities that try to bring about a set of meaning relations for a company. That there is a set of relations concerning itself that a company wants to project as the case. This may involve emphasising the traditional meaning relations that the company makes or it may involve restructuring them, to present the company as something different and changing, by means of a set of semantic structures that identify it and are viewed with positive regard by real or potential customers, shareholders, employees, whoever.

About science Lemke writes;

> When we talk science we are helping to create or re-create a community of people who share

> certain beliefs and values. We communicate best with those people who are already members of our community: those who have learned to use the language in the same ways that we do.
> (Lemke 90a, p.x)

From this I think one can argue that technical writing and public relations are about a company creating a discourse community with its audiences. Taken a step further one can say that this discourse community of people with shared purposes is not one that is centrally concerned with sharing communicative genres. The way activities unfold at work that constitute the work of a company do not necessarily need to be communicated to its shareholders. The public at large need not know the processes of a company's annual general meeting. What they all do need to know, and this may be a key function of both public relations and technical writing is the thematic formations of a company's communications. They need to know the typical semantic structures of a company, what a company is rather than what a company does. This rhetorical theme, accessed by this focus on the ideational aspects of the current data will be pursued in the following analytical chapter.

For science Lemke puts it this way.

> Science dialogue, then, has two patterns: an organisational pattern, represented by its activity structure, and a thematic pattern. In all dialogue there are at least two different things going on. First people are interacting with one another, move by move strategically playing within some set of expectations about

> what can happen next (the activity structure). But they are also constructing complex meanings about a particular topic by combining words and other symbols (the thematic pattern).
> (ibid, p.13)

I suggest that this is what is going on in public relations and technical writing texts. There is an activity structure of instructing someone how to use a technical object or persuading someone to use a product or a service belonging to a company. At the same time these texts are 'constructing complex meanings' about the company. I suspect that briefings in public relations and technical writing are about getting these complex meanings right. The consultant writer needs to recognise the important meanings that structure a company and the range of meanings these semantic units then enter into. Draft reviews then become sites where a consultant's faulty grasp of these core company meanings can be put right. The discourse analytic approach pursued so far has revealed the activity structures that shape the course that events typically run through in document design. The second part of the analysis will access the transfer of important and complex company meanings from client to consultant that takes place within these activity structures. It will access the semantics of these working practices which should then reveal, as I have speculatively been doing now, the rhetoric or the different rhetorics of professional document design.

To take a slightly different perspective, Lemke says;

Science education is to provide students with new ways of talking about scientific topics (ibid, p.21)

One could see public relations and technical writing as looking for new ways to write about technical subjects that aren't necessarily technical; ways of writing that make technology accessible to the consumer, popularisation. These ways, I am speculating, involve not using science genres such as the research paper but using popular familiar genres such as narrative or a problem - solution pattern. Additionally I speculate that the semantics of these texts are not the thematic formations of science so much as those of the company; the thematics of the way the company is structured and the thematic formations of the way the company wants to see itself.

To bring this speculation back within the dimensions of this thesis, what I am suggesting is that professional technical writers and public relations officers have the popular genres of their trade at their disposal. They can write a press release, a set of instructions or a persuasive expository text. What they need to learn from their clients, at briefings in particular, is the semantics that needs to be built into the text structure that will ensure the text is presenting the company in a suitable way. I believe that this is an activity that can be directly oriented to by both client and consultant on occasion but that it can also go on through the ways in which a client consistently encodes relations regarding the product or process in question. This semantic structuring needs to be picked up by the text writer and transferred to the written document to provide the semantics of the text genre that is being produced.

In Lemke (90b) he writes;

> We know that all these technical registers share certain linguistic features and many of us feel that there are even deeper rhetorical and text semantic similarities among them that have not yet been fully articulated. . . . features are also shared because of the similar social functions of all technical registers.
>
> Those social functions, the wider social uses of technical discourse change as society changes. Because we have mainly studied technical discourse from within its own view of itself, we have not always looked critically at the place of technical discourse within the larger system of social relationships among discourse varieties.
> (Lemke 90b, p.435)

These are the kinds of global issues that, although this thesis takes a micro analytical approach, cannot be ignored if not only the context of situation, but additionally the context of culture (Malinowski 1923) are to be accessed by this research. Attention will be paid to the social purposes of public relations and technical writing. It is hypothesised that a relational semantic focus within a multi functional approach, as I have outlined above, will provide a suitable analytical site for such work. The only limits to be placed on this approach is that it must be either available as evidence in the data of this thesis, which is data of the construction of public relations and technical writing, or else it must in some sense be demonstrably seen to shape the way these texts unfold.

A Dynamic and Synoptic Approach to Social Activity

Like other functional linguists (Martin, Ventola, Hasan etc) Lemke lays stress on the dynamic / synoptic split in available ways of viewing genre. He gives more support to the analyst centered synoptic view than most however. This is because the foregrounding of thematic formations or rhetorical structures in a text or group of texts `are not necessarily consciously recognised by participants other than the analyst', (Lemke 85, p.285). This is very much a view that supports the analyst centered approach to RST. Ways of encoding meaning may be `quite invisible and 'automatic'. Not all meanings in texts need to be demonstrably oriented to in order to be available to the analyst. Texts mean through lexis, grammar and discourse relations and these are available legitimate means of analysing interaction. To balance this, however, a dynamic perspective is much more participant centered.

One feature of activity structures emphasised by Lemke is that they must be completable. There must be a way of bringing them to an end. Once an ending has been accomplished then the piece of text is available as a synoptic structure, not only for the analyst, but as a completed meaning unit for the participants in the discourse. Whilst underway however a number of options are always available to the participants, not least of which is to leave any activity structure and do something else. Lemke stresses that genres are not straitjackets; they are just useful and typical ways of encoding social processes. On the dynamic aspect of genre Lemke writes;

> If a text from life turns out in a certain way, the path it took to get where it did depends on the moment to moment dynamic meanings that its creators, and we, responded to. We do not follow finished scripts.
> (Lemke 88b, p.161)

In the same article he states that

> The social meaning of an action is determined to a large extent by the activity structure context in which it is performed. Each action takes its meaning form a context which it itself helps to create. More precisely, the DYNAMIC meaning of an action is its meaning in the context up to now . . . at which point it has a further meaning potential contingent on the possible actions that may follow it within the same activity structure.
> (ibid, p.158)

I think because of the global intertextual approach that Lemke takes to genre he is able to incorporate some of the rigidity in the Sydney School approach to genre even with some quite conversation analytic concepts of context and the construction of action. Elsewhere he writes that

> Real texts and sequences of action are not pure

> ideal types; they do not necessarily stick to one genre or one thematic formation. Many texts mix different thematic formations, often creatively. Some texts also mix different genres. Semiotic analysis is not a straitjacket.
> (Lemke 90a, p.204)

This is exactly the kind of phenomenon I find in, for example, Tape 12 of the technical writing data. It is constructed largely as a draft check activity but for strategic reasons switches genre at certain points to become a briefing.

An equal weighting of the analyst centered synoptic focus on the completed text structures, coupled with recognition of speaker choice from moment to moment in the creation of those activity types is a flexible and powerful way of looking at social activity. Powerful because it extends the range of application to texts that do not fully fit a genre template, and to texts with other intertextual ties than genre, such as the same macro activity focus.

Semantically Centered Genre Analysis and Topic Type Analysis: Jay Lemke and Florence Davies

One further variation of semantic analysis that this thesis will make use of is the work on text type and topic type done by Florence Davies et al, (see Davies and Green 1984). The semantic structural approach in that work, though not particularly relational in character, is quite complementary to the views of genre taken by Lemke.

Both have produced books on teaching science. They take different perspectives; Lemke's is a book of the activity structures and thematic formations that occur in science classrooms. Davies & Green is a theoretical approach to teaching reading in the sciences. Both, however, conclude that, in Lemkean terms, in science there is a meaning pattern apart from the activity structure of the lesson, and that this is a pattern of semantic relationships that describes the thematic content, the science content of a particular topic area. Lemke asks the question

> How, in short, can we teach thematic patterns in the classroom as we use them?
> (Lemke 90a, p.100)

The best answer is to be found in Davies and Green. Kay 1991 summarises the Davies approach.

> The approach is based on the premise that writers make choices at the lexico - grammatical level and rhetorical levels in order to achieve their purpose, but in doing so they draw upon the underlying information which they wish to present and over which they have very little choice. It thus focuses on the semantic or information level of text.
> (Kay 91, p.2)

This sounds remarkably like Lemke and Hasan. The focus on writer purpose also provides a link with the RST approach to text. What Davies wants to get at is the semantic structure of information in science text books. She suggests that this is something largely given; not within the control of the writer, a cultural norm in other words. This is just Lemke's (and the Sydney school's) view of the thematic formations of science. They have to be learned by children as there is n other available way of talking about science. Davies & Green develop an approach to teaching the reading of science texts from this conceptual approach. It is an approach based on what they call topic types. The supporting hypothesis for this approach is as follows.

> While it is possible to envisage an infinite number of topics which might be written about in the sciences and humanities, there is a strictly limited set of topic types.
> (Davies & Green 84, p.77)

Again, this is in keeping not only with Lemke's view of rhetorical structures and thematic formations, but also with RST. It is because the number of analytical units is relatively few that the analytical power is great. Once the topic types of science can be measured in single figures then this can provide the basis of a teaching method. Students can be taught to recognise semantic information patterns that contain the subject matter of science.

Each topic type is seen as being constituted by information constituents. These are glossed as 'elements of content' and 'information slots', (ibid, p.39). Again these are clearly semantic units. Davies and Green say that regardless of the particular purpose of a scientific text, whether it be 'to describe or explain or initiate others into ways of observing' (ibid, p.38), that the way the information itself is a given. The way it is structured will depend on the purpose of the text, but the structuring of the information will be consistent within the field of science. Once again, this complements the Lemkean and Hasan views of genre. The purpose of a text is likely to be revealed through its unfolding activity structure but its ideational content is recoverable through its thematic formations, through its semantic structure; seen in a less relational way, through its topic types.

A topic type then consists of a number of information constituent units. These are not necessarily unique to a topic type; they occur in different combinations to constitute different ones. Again the comparison with thematic formations is obvious. Semantic units are few in number, it is the way they relate with each other that produces types of text and it is the contexts with which they relate and their sequential positioning coupled with their own sequential structure that construct generic social action. Information constituents provide the slots that constitute the various kinds of science text: examples include Physical Structure, Process, Hypothesis - Theory and Classification. Each of these has a different but partly overlapping set of information constituent slots which any example text can fill but which needn't be filled. The analysis then becomes self checking if too few slots are filled and the text residue is too large. Again in keeping with Lemke, Davies says that students will learn an intertextual approach to reading science by using the topic type method. Students will see patterns and links between different scientific texts, even if the actual subject matter is quite different. This notion is conceivably transferable to professional discourse;

that companies will structure information about themselves in a culturally limited or culturally defining set of ways.

A Triangulation of Discourse Analysis, Topic Type Analysis and Rhetorical Structure Theory

Use of the Davies model has been made in the discourse chapters of this thesis as a suitable high level unit to discover generic features of social activity from a sequential perspective. The model has been used to describe the rather rigid nature of a design presentation and the looser structure of briefings and draft reviews. It will be reapplied in a different way in the RST analysis chapters to follow.

RST is a powerful way of showing what a monologic piece of interaction is meant to achieve. These purposes should vary somewhat from stage to stage of the document design process and this should be reflected in varying recurring kinds of rhetorical organisation in the monologic texts. RST should also be of assistance in recognising semantic structure in texts; what kind of relations are typically holding between what kind of referents. In this way the thematic formations of document design will become accessible, permitting a study not only of document design genres but also of its types of field of activity: technical writing and public relations.

Topic type analysis is a useful and complementary tool of analysis in this area. It identifies the basic information constituents that occur in the four basic, though at some times generically mixed activities to be investigated. These are a public relations draft review, a technical writing draft review, mixed with some briefing activity, a public relations briefing, in two quite distinct styles, and a technical writing briefing. Topic type analysis should reveal whether the same topic types occur in a public relations brief and a technical writing brief. To the extent that they do not, one is discovering elements of difference in the two fields of activity. Other differences will be looked for between genres, and the Davies model will provide a third source of analytical evidence alongside RST and discourse analysis for any conclusions that may be drawn. RST should also be useful in recognising not only the semantic constituents that are the information units of technical writing and public relations but also the pragmatic interpersonal aspects of the activities as they unfold stage by generic stage. It may well be that while the activity field has different semantic structures in it, as revealed by topic type analysis and RST, the interpersonal function remains similar, as revealed by discourse analysis and RST. The triangulation of analytical approaches provides the means of a mutifunctional analysis of these professional texts. The product of this analysis in toto should then reveal rhetorical and cultural features of these socially situated professional activities.

Conclusion

To start answering Eija Ventola's question that she puts regarding rhetorical structure and genre, at this stage, one can say that it would be too simplistic to expect texts of one genre to have one rhetorical structure. There have to be alternative semantic and pragmatic means of achieving similar activity goals. One would expect to see some rhetorical relation patterning in terms of the relations the relations themselves enter into. In other words, especially at the top levels of organisation one might expect some relations to meaningfully co-occur. Variations in patterns of rhetorical relation will then be accountable for in terms of contingent details of the particular processes; degrees of shared knowledge for example, and in terms of professional strategy. In addition to seeking a rhetorical structure - genre connection RST should also reveal intertextual links between texts of a semantic nature, that has been a weak point of Sydney school work. A preliminary answer to Eija Ventola's question then is `not necessarily', and that the range of questions that one can ask of RST in a genre or intertextual context are broader and more interesting than that.

CHAPTER 9 SAMPLE RHETORICAL STRUCTURE THEORY ANALYSIS OF TECHNICAL WRITING AND PUBLIC RELATIONS TEXTS

9.1 Introduction

In both this and the next chapter emphasis will shift to design activities which construct a technical writing document. This chapter will open by giving a detailed example of monologic structure in the public relations data. This will function as a bridge between viewing these document design genres from a discourse perspective and viewing them from a RST perspective. It will also provide a lead in from the familiar public relations data to the as yet unfamiliar technical writing material. This chapter will present an exhaustive analysis of one or two monologic units from each recording with the primary aim of showing a working RST analysis of spoken data. Attention will be drawn to the range of features highlighted by this analysis that are seen differently or remain unnoticed from a discourse perspective. Initial observations on generic features of these texts, made available through RST Analysis, will be raised to be developed in the next chapter, where the focus will be on genre, rather than the RST apparatus.

9.2 The Public Relations Briefing

Preliminary

The example RST structures from Tape 4 are both chosen from part 4a, Derek's brief to Juliana. The monologic units that I will use are two of the schemas produced by Derek as his contribution to the briefing of Juliana on his document. These examples are to show how monologic spoken data can be accommodated to RST analysis. They will show the range of spans that are necessary to account for this data. Where possible, I am picking typical examples. Hypotheses will be developed in this chapter which will then be tested and refined in the following chapter, which will look more generally at all the RST data to find regularly occurring characteristics that belong to draft checking and to briefings.

Background to Tape 4a RST Unit 8

This unit occurs after Frank has done some introductory talk on Derek's brochure for Juliana. Frank has placed Derek's document in relation to Bob's and given an overview of the features of Derek's. Juliana has then sought some clarification on the nature of the relationship between the two documents and Frank has gone to some lengths to correct her view by giving an example of how the two documents might get used differently. At this point Derek's turn opens. He seeks permission from Frank to talk and clearly expects to have an extended turn to pass on the information he has to Juliana as he has made notes for this purpose. From this point on Derek has the floor through the next three RS schemas. Between units 8 and 10 there is no gap. It is only Derek who segments his talk, moving from one section of his brief to another. Unit 9, and the following monologic unit, Unit 10, are separated only by a clarification request from Juliana. Other than this no one speaks more than three consecutive words throughout this turn which altogether consists of 50 `clauses'. These are units often of clause length but not necessarily so, which provide a sensible discourse unit of meaning, akin to what Hasan and Martin call `message', to determine rhetorical relations for.

Other speakers' turns function only as acknowledgement, confirmation request and agreement. There is no other function to their interjection. At no time do they deflect the direction of Derek's talk. That said, Derek's talk is very much recipient designed as I hope the coming RST analysis will show. It is produced very much with each of the other two participants in mind. This section of talk then, provides a good example of what I am analysing as `monolog'. Other speakers only produce minor turns. It is produced in order to fulfil part of the communicative purpose of the event in question. It is performed cooperatively, there is no attempt to take the floor back from Derek. Frank has given him permission to go ahead and Juliana is letting Derek brief her. Additionally, it has a place in the interaction as a whole. That is one can see where the talk has got to for such a monolog to occur and one can see reasons, interactively, why the monolog comes to an end. To what extent this third characteristic is true for the technical writing data remains to be seen, where monolog is very much the order of the day. In fact, this might prove to be one of the distinguishing features of these agnate professional genres.

It seems plausible to me, from this description of the talk that led up to the monolog, and from the data for Unit 8 that Derek's monolog here can be called 'transaction initial'. Frank has done a general briefing for Juliana and a point of misunderstanding has been cleared up. Derek doesn't have to interrupt Frank's clarification in order to find the space for his turn. He does however choose an opportune moment to seek permission.

F	res elab	And then this looks good I'll go and I mean I've written in from the vc an invitation to come and look round
J	ack	right
F	reform	so the chap writes in let's just say in an ideal scenario I'm from a biochemical company can I come and then he gets Derek and Derek's thing.
D	ack per req	yes. Can I
F	per	yeah, go ahead Derek
D	per req	Could I
F	proc sugg	You talk about your thing now
D	per req	May I talk about [my thing cos I jotted a few notes
F	per	yeah that's best]
D	elab explain	they're based on considerable interaction with Frank already about this cos we've talked
J	ack	yes
D	cont inf	to each other about it The purposes of our publication are first of all to attract collaboration

(Tape 4 pre RST Unit 8)

Frank's example of how the documents would combine in use may well have been complete. Derek has chosen a 'transition relevant point' or 'TRP' (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson 74) therefore to establish his right to a longer turn. On the other hand Frank may have had more to say, more detail to give on the use of Derek's document. Derek, however, has not just waited for a `TRP' to start his turn, he has picked what seems to him an opportune moment to provide the information he is ready with for Juliana. It is this point which may be being negotiated by Frank and Derek in their permission exchange. The lack of pauses between speakers at this transition point again suggests the expectedness of what Derek does next. There is no surprise quality to his grabbing the floor, and no resistance. This is a collaboratively achieved team changeover to enable a team briefing to take place.

The monolog comes to an end after Unit 10, when Derek leaves off presenting information which has clearly agreed status, (see Chapter 6 for details). Rather than provide briefing units for Juliana, Derek now starts to negotiate the status of what he is saying with Frank. Frank's choices at this point are either to accept or acknowledge the points Derek is making or challenge them in some way, with negative evaluation or rejection or an alternative proposal. If he had accepted then it is possible that Derek would have continued. If as here, he negatively evaluates the situation Derek is proposing and seeks a decision proposal from Derek that would improve the situation then there are decisions to be made that involve at least two party talk and the monologic nature of the brief ends.

RST Analysis of Unit 8

Key Relations
List

The top level rhetorical structure relation here is List. As the RST structure diagram shows, there are three sections to this top level List relation; 3-9, 10-14, and 15-19. Each stands separately as a subsection on the purposes of the brochure. We will see later that there are other top level schemas that can occur in briefing talk such as this, notably involving Enablement relations, but the straightforward presentation of information in a List relation is a typical rhetorical structure for a briefing.

The Justification Relation

Another feature of Derek's briefings is his regular use of one kind of Justify satellite, (1-2, 8, 11, 19). Justification is a commonly occurring high level rhetorical structure but in my data is only used by Derek in this one fashion. According to Stewart

> in a JUSTIFY relation, the satellite text span attempts to establish the appropriateness or right of the speaker to put forth the claims made or action taken in the other part, such that the acceptance of the JUSTIFY satellite by the listener increases her or his acceptance of the nucleus.
> (Stewart 87, p.240)

Most examples of Justify satellites involve the speaker delivering reasons for his beliefs. Derek's, however, only involve telling Juliana that the information he is giving her has already been agreed with Frank. This point has been made earlier, that a briefing must consist of information that is agreed upon by the client team. This is true whether it is being given to a designer or a technical writer. The problems that occur in Tape 4b are due to the lack of this prior agreement, as are some of the genre mixing features that will be discussed from Tape 12.

I would not have considered such talk to be codable as Justification satellites except that there is a similar usage in Thompson & Mann 1987. I feel that this kind of language, where you justify what you say not by supporting evidence for the claims you make, but by addressing the status of the information you give, is a different relation or at least that the two uses of Justify are likely to occur in different contexts as part of different texts. Neither Frank nor Derek have need to justify the information they give to Juliana, in the sense of validating its correctness or truth value. However, it is a necessary condition for providing information that can function as a briefing unit that it be agreed by all the parties who operate as client. Frank takes this condition for granted, so there are no Justify relations in his talk. Derek in contrast, continuously draws attention to it. Incorporating Justification remains an option then in doing a brief and functions to account for the status of the information being provided.

The Importance of High Level Relations

Stewart (1987) recognised that it is the rhetorical relations occurring at a high or mid level that are likely to be responsible for the way a text functions.

> ... it is the higher level relations, those at the 'top' of the diagram, so to speak, that provide the basic scaffolding of interclausal coherence.
> (Stewart 87, p.126)

This is an expectation of this research also. At present all the relations in these sample texts will be described, but in the next chapter, that looks for generic features in the placement and structure of monologic text in document design meetings, only high and mid level structures will be discussed unless there is something of a particular nature at a lower level that needs to be accounted for in order to make sense of the more general meaning of the monolog. It is a hypothesis of this research that the relations that exist to tie major sections of each monolog together are the relations which will highlight the generic purpose of the texts in question, and that the lower level relations are more likely to account for local contingent specific features of any particular occurrence of a generic activity.

Matching Relations

The List relation is the top level text organising relation in this monolog. Justify occurs at a mid and low level. There is a Justify satellite in each of the three List structures. Each chunk of information in this opening section of Derek's brief is justified by Derek in terms of the status of the information as agreed or not agreed between himself and Frank. RST, as an analytical method draws attention to these matching functional relations as they are constructed in longer turns at speech. It is a supposition of this thesis that to the extent that a speaker can produce matching relations, parallel constructions within his turn, that this is evidence of planning and purpose to the talk rather than extemporisation. Furthermore this kind of planning and organisation are deemed likely to occur when a regular kind of talk, a familiar activity is being produced. Such units are likely sites for generic activity to be taking place.

The Result relation occurs twice in this first section of Derek's talk at a mid level. The first List element is structured as a Result span. In 3-4 Derek gives the prime purpose of the document. Then in 5-8 he says what the consequences are of that purpose. The Result span is marked by the conjunction `so'. The second List element is first justified and then has a Result structure. Again, the Result satellite is marked with the conjunction `so'. The third List element is again justified, this time as not yet having received Frank's approval. This Justification itself is in a point - concession relation. There is no Result relation, rather the issue is elaborated on in 18. Derek specifies what he means by `a boost to internal ego'. He then gives positive Assessment to this third purpose for the document.

Reasons can be suggested for this variation in the construction of briefing units. Arguably the first two listed items do not require any positive evaluation as they have Frank's approval and that is sufficient.In the third part of the List structure Derek is seeking approval for his idea and supports what he says with positive evaluation. I think it will become clear that the Concession and Assessment relations are likely to occur in persuasive text rather than factual text. Although Derek structures his talk at the top level as a list of items, and Stewart identifies LIST as a likely top level relation in factual, report texts (1987, p.123-4), we see within this structuring, where necessary, the presence of more persuasive relations such as Concession, Justification and Positive Assessment. Stewart's weather report text (1987, p.123-29) is also a List of three items each with lower level Result relations and Elaboration. Her text is `wholeheartedly factual' with `no interest in stimulating any specific response from the listener/reader' (op cit). This cannot be said of the briefing. Derek does want to pass on uncontroversial information to Juliana but at the same time he wants her and Frank's approval of what he says and thus we find these more persuasive relations occurring at lower levels in the structure.

Summary

We have been able to analyse this part of the monolog using only 7 relations, namely LIST, RESULT, JUSTIFY, SUMMARY, CONCESSION, ELABORATE, and ASSESSMENT. There is also regularity in the way these relations occur. Each part of the List has a Justify relation and the first two have a Result relation, while the third, with its different information status, has Concession and Positive Assessment relations attached. I will look at the next section of Derek's monolog, that continues without interruption, to see if it consists of similar relations. If the relations are different then reasons will be looked for to explain this.

RST Analysis of Unit 9

Key Relations
List

Derek's monolog does continue with a top level List structure. 3-11 is one part and 12 - 22 the second. 3-11 deals with how this document relates to other department publicity material and 12 - 22 describes how the package can be used. In briefings List structures identify the various semantic slots that are available within a briefing topic type. More will be said on topic type analysis in the next chapter.

3-11 breaks down into another List structure. 3-5 is showing Juliana the old publicity which will be replaced, and 6-11 is showing Juliana what existing material the new document will have to complement. There is no Justify or Result relation in either of these spans. The talk is noticeably different to that in Unit 8, as Derek is now actually showing Juliana what it is he is talking about. Also, in Unit 8 Derek was stating purpose and the Result clause specified what that purpose was, by explaining the consequences of such a purpose. Purposes and consequences seem likely co-occurring relations. In unit 9, however, Derek is showing previously used material and the consequences of its being old are hard to think of. There is a `so' clause, no 5, but this I think is merely summarizing 3. Although conjunctions can be a useful guide to rhetorical relations they are certainly not an infallible guide. One needs to judge the relationship of the adjacent text spans and decide in which way they relate to each other without relying on the lexical clue. Lexical clues are far more useful for recognising assessment and problem relations. Then one is dealing with what Winter and Francis call `vocabulary 3', text organising vocabulary (Winter 1982, Francis (1986). Conjunctions on the other hand, as Schiffrin (1987) has demonstrated, can have a lexical meaning, but they can also be used purely with a discourse function as a link between stretches of discourse. Here Derek uses the `so' to introduce a restatement and then to move on to another point. He does the same thing in between these two sections of monolog, Unit 8 and Unit 9.

D. You're nodding so you are
F [oh definitely definitely
D happy with that.] Now, so that's this this
package as a whole ok
J mm mm mm
(Tape 4a, pre Unit 9)

Derek sums up what he has done as preparation to open a new section of his talk. `So' is functioning solely as a discourse marker and without its lexical meaning.

Having closed down the first part of this List structure with a Summary, Derek produces the second part of it with his main point first, 6, which he then elaborates. He specifies what he means by 'complementation exercise'. Here there is embedded elaboration. 7 is the nucleus of the Elaboration satellite 7-11 and 8 is the nucleus of the Elaboration satellite 8-10. 11 provides a Summary of 6-10 and marks the end of this section of talk. Although there are no Result or Justification relations in this whole section from 1-11, I think this can be accounted for in a way that shows that Derek is doing a similar job to the one started in Unit 8. Elaboration is a way of specifying just as giving results is. Purposes can be specified by giving their consequences; other information can be specified by giving more information about it. The lack of Justification is, I think, because Derek is now talking about something that belongs to his department, so there is no need to attest the status of this information by publicly agreeing it with Frank.

In the second half of this List structure, 12-22, however, there is a prominent Justification relation. Indeed it prefaces the point. On every other occasion the List relation has opened with the main point that has then expanded upon. Now Derek chooses to introduce the item with a Justification relation (12-13) which announces that its status as a briefing unit is uncertain. This is because Derek is predicting disagreement from Frank. 14 I label Background. It is interesting to see how Derek marks out the main recipient of what he is saying. 12 -13 is aimed at Frank though clearly it is of importance to Juliana too to know the status of the information she hears. Now Derek, in 14, returns to doing a brief by declaring Juliana the recipient of his talk. What this Background satellite achieves then is the return the talk to its main objective, of doing a brief. And it does so by defining what the previous List structure was about, the package as a whole, as a way of preparing the way to establish a new main point or nucleus for this List structure. It comes in 15. Again, in the company of Justify relations we find Concession, as Derek attempts to be persuasive rather than just informative. 16-18 I have labelled Elaborate, ignoring 'so' as a lexical marker of consequence. Nevertheless the relation is rather close. One is only making plausible analysis after all. I don't think the ambiguity lies in what Derek meant, however, so much as in the fuzzy edges to the relations themselves. Clearly what Derek says next specifies what 'it can also be broken down' means, and specification is one sub classification of Elaboration (Stewart 1987, Mann & Thompson passim). It is also arguable that 16-18 describe the consequences of this breakable down character of the new document.

The point is, then, that in this extract from Derek's brief a main point usually occurs first and is then elaborated by means of specification or consequence. Both satellites do a similar job of providing more information on the subject at hand. Already, although this analysis is meant to be only a sample of RST as an analytical approach, we are unavoidably discovering basic properties of a brief, of Derek's way of doing a brief at least, that were not so apparent when the an interactive perspective was taken. One is also discovering variation, made apparent through RST analysis, that can be accounted for in terms of the subject matter of the briefing unit. This is indicative of the move, occasioned by RST analysis, from a sequential to a semantic and pragmatic focus.

The Elaboration relation at the bottom level, 16-18, breaks down into another List relation 16-18 and within that a Disjunct relation (Stewart p.234). Basically these are an `and ' relation and an `or' relation respectively. Just as the List structure in Unit 8 (3-9) has a Summary relation, and as do 3-5 and 6-11 in this span, so does this List structure end with a Summary, 19-23. This seems to function as a completion marker for items of information and Juliana seems to orient to that by producing a clarification request at this stage, once it seems Derek has said all he wants to say on this point.

Pragmatic and Semantic Relations

Many RST relations are basic logical relations that are usually clearly signalled by conjunctions. There is a basic difference between relations like LIST and DISJUNCT, that tend to be clearly marked, and relations like JUSTIFY, CONCESSION and ASSESSMENT which needn't be. Mann, Matthiessen & Thompson (92) have suggested that there are a number of ways of classifying their list of relations one of which is into semantic and pragmatic relations, with JUSTIFY, ASSESSMENT, and CONCESSION all being pragmatic. It is these pragmatic relations in particular that the analyst can only make plausible judgements about. These chapters will present the most important of these pragmatic relations for this data, the ones that occur at mid and top levels of hierarchy, and show them in enough similar contexts, such as doing a briefing or a draft review, to discover what relations tend to co-occur, and what these co-occurring relations function as within the same or a similar social activity. Not only should this be revealing of the meanings that are constructed in these activities but, in reverse, it should provide assistance to the analyst in making plausible judgements about rhetorical relations. If other relations that normally co-occur with a JUSTIFY relation, for example, are present then it is reasonable to look for a JUSTIFY relation within that stretch of discourse or else to account for its absence. Although one always bemoans the paucity of one's data I believe I have enough example texts of a limited set of activities taking place, with enough monolog providing a good number of spans for analysis, for this aim to be carried out. This will then provide a second set of genre characteristics for these professional activities. They should complement and refine those discovered through discourse analysis in Part One of this thesis. The texts then may be viewed generically both from an interactive and from a semantic, non sequential perspective. To my knowledge, no other published research has used RST in this way.

9.3 The Public Relations Draft Review

Preliminary

Tape 1 is the public relations draft review. The client is Focus Technology, a subsidiary of Courtaulds and the pro works for a private consultancy. This is probably the text that delivers most from a discourse analytic perspective. Turns tend not to be long, especially compared with the draft review in Tape 12. The main function of each move is relatively easily identifiable and fits a basic pattern for enacting decision making in a document review context. Furthermore, because the discourse analysis could handle this data so thoroughly it supported the production of a flow chart that accounted for the actions taken in the data and the range of choices open at particular point in the talk. [2]

That said, there are 10 rhetorical structure spans that I have identified in this 35 minute long review. Not surprisingly none of these schemas has a top level List structure such as was found in the Tape 4 Briefing monologs. This basic text difference can operate as a means of separating out the different functions of monologic talk within these two stages of document design activity. Clearly, more is going on in a briefing than just the transfer of factual or client team agreed information. However, what happens often goes on within a text structure that is suited to just such an activity. The optimum purpose of briefings then is to impart client held information relevant to the designer. The success rate for this type of activity is far higher in Tape 4a than Tape 4b as the discourse analysis has shown. There is a corresponding increase in top level List structure schemas in 4a compared to 4b. The monologic talk in Tape 1 has no such top level structures. The commonest top level structure is Solutionhood. These monologs fit the problem - solution pattern for text (Hoey 1983).

Background to Tape 1 RST Unit 5

RST Unit 5 is an example of a monolog with a high level Solutionhood structure. It is however different from all the other examples I shall give in this Chapter in that it is produced jointly by both participants. The client initially produces a Solutionhood relation text and this is built on by a monolog of similar length, 8 `clauses', by the pro, which is in an Assessment relation to the client's solution, giving a negative evaluation of his suggestion. This means that Assessment appears as the top level relation in this stretch of talk, and I think this fits the function of the text. The client produces a Solutionhood text as a support for his proposal that `eco engineering' might be a good term. The pro's assessment of this proposal is an assessment of all the talk the client produced. This still leaves Ian's proposal as the nucleus of the whole text (4-7) but puts the Problem on a lower level of the text hierarchy than the Assessment. This results in the Assessment relation standing as the central organising principle for the text as a whole, which intuitively seems correct. Because unusually, both participants do produce a stretch of monolog, the key relation in the text is that which links the two spans produced by the different speakers.

In the discourse chapter dealing with this text I pointed out that although this interaction fits the discourse model for making decision proposals and assessing them, it is peculiar in so far as it is the client who is coining terminology, and the pro who turns it down on the grounds of how this would reflect on the company. Compared to the other decisioning in this text, roles are reversed. In particular, it is the pro doing the negative assessment and rejection of the client's proposal that is unusual. This peculiarity is evident in the rhetorical structure analysis in that both parties produce interlocking monologic talk. There is little evidence of this elsewhere in the data. Usually after one person has finished an extended turn, there is a need for something to be worked out interactively rather than one long turn creating the space for another - at least in the data before me.

RST Analysis of Unit 5
Key Relations
Solutionhood, Assessment.

The client's text 1-7 forms a Solutionhood relation. The Solutionhood satellite is section 1-2. This then is the Problem. Hoey regularly refers to this section of a problem solution text as `that part of the situation in need of a solution' (Hoey 83). This is quite how the client words it. It isn't so much that there is a problem with the text rather that something is missing which should be in it. Thus there is a situation requiring a solution, a broader term than just problem.

1 is a Circumstance relation in that it serves to orient the participants to the section of text now under consideration. 2 is the nucleus. It is this text that presents the problem to be dealt with. The Solutionhood nucleus comes in parts 3 - 7. It supplies the missing fundamentals, the specific things that differentiate Focus Technology from other process engineering outfits. 3 is in a Concessive relation to 4-7. The client is conceding a point to the pro. Yes, he is sure there is a problem but he isn't sure he has the answer. In Tape 4a we saw that Concession was a likely constituent of persuasive text. It only occurred in text aimed at the pro by the client with the purpose of affecting his judgement. Here we are also in a

persuasive text. This is especially the case in this stretch of the talk as Ian is going to produce candidate text for Suzanne to assess, a reversal of the usual means of operation.

The Solutionhood nucleus occupies 4 -7. It is constructed as a Elaborate plus List relation; the client makes his proposal in 4 and then elaborates on it by means of specification in 5-7, which is the two part List relation. 4 makes the general decision proposal, which is to put into the text those points `where maybe we can distinguish ourselves from the run of the mill process engineering'. 5-7 then specifies what those things might be; `our expertise in energy via process integration and in environmental or ecological or eco engineering'. 7 is an elaboration of 6. It makes the proposal more specific by suggesting that the term `eco engineering' could be used in the document. It is this specific proposal in 7 at which the pro's negative Assessment text is directed.

The Assessment Relation

This comes in a two part List structure. 8 is the first free standing negative Assessment and suggests that the in house public relations person would not like the term. 9-15 give this pro's own reasons for not accepting it. The reason is given in 9-11 and then restated in a similar rhetorical organisation in 12- 15. 9 is concessive to the coming nucleus; `I quite like the terminology but'. Again we see Concession as a likely relation to occur in persuasive text. The pro details her negative Assessment. This then gives the client something to agree or disagree with, which allows the interactive pattern of this kind of talk to develop and reach a stopping point on this issue. The main reason for the rejection is given in 10 -11. This itself is a Condition relation, where 10 states the hypothetical situation of having taken up the term `eco engineering and 11 gives the negative scenario that would ensue in that hypothetical world.

At this point Ian concedes, but Suzanne continues her talk and produces what is a Restate relation in 12 - 15. This time she expands the Concession satellite, thus showing common ground with her client and restates the Problem in 15. Restatement, in Stewart's taxonomy, is a relation `where essentially the satellite portion repeats the material presented in the nucleus' (Stewart 86, p.249). She also rightly adds that

> rather than providing simple reinforcement, a RESTATEMENT satellite may give a different `slant' than the nucleus...
> (op cit, p.249)

This I think is the most common case. In my data verbatim restatements are rare and rewordings tend to always add something or reweight the original. Even here, where the Restatement mirrors the Concession relation of the original we find this change in weight so more text is packed into the Concession and the already agreed main point of Assessment has a reduced textualisation. RST is a useful analytical tool for foregrounding this kind of detailed micro analysis of a turn.

Summary

This example text is a neat fit of two monologs building a joint rhetorical structure. One reason why this may occur in this recording is that this draft review is a regular discursive activity for these participants, and they have a long and friendly interpersonal relationship. Perhaps this makes it easier to slot longer turns together and to collaboratively produce such a text structure rather than needing to return to an interactive pattern, if only to clarify and assure oneself of the situation. As briefly mentioned, there is some interaction going on during these monologic turns. Suzanne's initial response to the client's proposal is laughter, which Ian joins in. This would suggest that there is little `face' problem between these participants, (Brown and Levinson 78). Secondly, in between 8-11 and 12-15 there is acceptance of the pro's position by the client. This is shown firstly by his `other complete' of her assessment in 11, and secondly by providing his own compatible evaluation of the Assessment she is making, that using such a term would be `a bit risky'.

Thus the agreed assessment of this position is reached interactively. The pro restates in 12- 15, and once again, as she reaches 15, the nucleus of the Assessment, the client does an other complete, clearly showing acceptance of the position put forward by the pro.

As main talk controller, control of the talk, if this activity is over, returns to the client. He uses this position to show that the eco engineering subject is closed, at least for the present. There is a pause, which I would call his pause, following Sacks et al (1974) and Goodwin (1981), as both parties orient to this part of the talk being complete. It is then largely up to the client to initiate the next point of issue. So we get cl pause + frame marker, `alright' as the verbal means of moving on to the next section.

There is an interactional framework around the rhetorical structure organisation of the monologs. We can see the place of the monolog in terms of the discourse patterns previously detailed for this social activity; as a decision proposal and its rejection, as one available path through a decision making cycle. The fit between monolog and dialogue in the technical writing data, where there is such an increased quantity of single party talk, making the discourse patterning that has been described for the public relations text less evident, will be approached in reverse. The interactive structure of the activity will only be recognisable once regularity in the structure and function of the monologic units has been ascertained.

RST Analysis of Unit 8

Key Relations
Solutionhood and Enablement

This example is a top level Solutionhood structure, the longest monolog in this meeting, of 32 `clauses' produced by the client. He is the most common producer of monolog in the meeting with six instances to the pro's 3. Generally the client produces monolog to initiate problem - solution text or else to produce or support his own preferred solution. The pro's monologs tend to be justificatory or supportive in some way of her own original text that is coming under attack from the client.

This unit shows Solutionhood co-occurring with Enablement. This is a common pattern to be investigated in the technical writing data. It is possible for either to be the top level relation. Here it is Solutionhood with Enablement occurring within the Solutionhood nucleus. The List relation is prevalent in the Solutionhood nucleus also, but apart from separating out the two matching Enablement relations, it only occurs at lower levels of the hierarchy, and is consequently not so influential as a text organising relation. (Stewart 1987). This is one consistent difference between the public relations Briefing in Tape 4a and this public relations draft review. In the briefing the List relation is consistently and accountably an important text organising relation. In the draft review, equally accountably it is not, and its place is taken by Solutionhood or Solutionhood related relations.

Solutionhood or Solutionhood Related Relations

As is usual for this relation, at least as it occurs in this data, the satellite precedes the nucleus; problem before solution. 1-10 is the satellite and 11 - 32 the lengthy solution element. 3 is the nucleus of the satellite, 'we had our reservations'. 1-2 counts as Background. It is information necessary to understanding not only what is to follow but also its source. The point being that Ian is not the source of the negative evaluation or the solution to it that is to follow. It is another member of the client team responsible for electrical engineering. The role of one client as intermediary between the consultant and another client is more evident in Tape 12, the technical writing draft review, where both clients are present. Nevertheless this is a good reminder that, on the client side at least, more than one person is likely to be responsible for, or at least to contribute to, the construction of the client position.

Justification and Assessment

Having made the negative evaluation in 3, the rest of the Problem satellite justifies this assessment. Justification is another relation that regularly keeps company with Solutionhood and occurs as a top level relation itself in texts where problem - solution patterns are evident.

5-7 is the nucleus of this Justification. This breaks down again into the main point in 5, `we were putting across a message . . . it was really just a statement of fact'. 6-7 I am labelling Assessment. It tells the pro why this is a bad thing. I think this could be seen as just Elaboration but following Stewart's example, if a stronger relation can be found use it. Yes, 6-7 does elaborate 5 by specifying it. The point is, is there a reason for this elaboration, over and above the need to be more specific. In this case there is; to provide Assessment of the main justification of the negative evaluation being given to the pro's text. 6-7 itself forms a Concession relation. This is a regularly collocating relation with negative evaluation in this data; softening its force and showing some sympathy with the offender's position. It also serves to impress that the Assessment is not because what the pro has written is inaccurate. This is sometimes the case in this recording and more often so in the technical writing draft review. The problem here lies in that what is being written is not specific to the client company. The Solution nucleus in RST Unit 5 of Tape 1 called for a focus on those areas that will distinguish Focus Technology from 'run of the mill' process engineers. Here the establishment of a problem with the text is justified on similar grounds; 'why us and nobody else you know'. To clarify and prove his point Ian now offers evidence from the offending section of text. He reads out the text in clause 8 and then in 9-10 provides a matching pattern of rhetorical organisation for the Assessment with 6-7. Like 6-7, 9-10 is also an Assessment span constructed as a Concession relation. In RST Unit 5 we also found a matching rhetorical pattern in the restatement of the pro's assessment of the client's proposal. There however, the restatement served to soften the blow, giving more attention to the concessive satellite. Here if anything the concession is minimalised in 9, 'yeah yeah they are'. and the impact of the negative assessment increased in 10 by suggesting the document will fail to impress and perhaps not even be read if it contains such information 'but I don't need to read Focus Technology's brochure to find out'.

Enablement

The Solutionhood nucleus is a List relation in two parts with matching rhetorical relations. Both parts consist of a high level Enablement structure inside which there is a List structure. We find List occurring at a mid to low level; separating items of information but not playing a significant part in the pragmatic organisation of this text. The key relation in this Solutionhood nucleus is Enablement. I am labelling both 11 and 22 as Enablement nuclei.

This is a relation prominent in both technical writing texts but belonging predominantly to the activity of briefing. In linguistic terms, briefing can be seen as being an enabling activity. There is an information gap preventing a designer or technical writer from doing their job. A brief is the activity that enables them to fulfil their duties, or at least to progress with them.

The communicative event taking place in this recording is basically a draft review. However, from looking at all the data, it seems that any staged activity that is part of the document design process can call upon earlier activity types when required. In other words a draft review at times needs to do the work of a briefing. This happens in Tape 12, where it is clear the technical writer is still ignorant or misinformed on what are key elements in the system for the client. In this recording this section is the most complete negative evaluation of the pro's work. It calls for a complete rewrite of one section of the draft document. The client however, rather than linger on the problem aspects of the pro's text focuses on the solution. This solution comes in the form of written notes from a colleague, expert in the relevant area of electrical engineering.

Retrospective Coding

What I am calling enablement nuclei are 11;

> `so he's made a few notes',

and more obviously clause 22;

> `so he's written out a bit of text here along the lines of a bit of a brief'

It may not be clear at 11 that this text is an Enablement text, but clearly by the end of the second span of the List, 22-32 the pro has realised that the information being given is to enable a rewrite. This is the way she reintroduces interaction and brings this monolog to an end.

Suz	laugh [so is this all is this all got to be
Ian	[I've got to admit he he actually spent five] minutes on this] before he reviews somebody this afternoon
Suz	Alright Has this all got to be rewritten . this bit
Ian	I think we've got to do something with it let's have a look
Suz	No this bit [here
Ian	[yeah]
Suz	none of it's any good
Ian	Well I'm just going to have a look . . demanded with ?? . .? ?? . . . . I think basically that he decided that that bit was
Suz	iffy
Ian	yeah . . . .ok that's a little bit along the lines of what he was saying ??? . . sorry about that bit .. yes it can but again it's a statement of fact
Suz	ohh
Ian	If you can .
Suz	wo[rk it
Ian	[turn it] around a little bit

Suz mmm
(Tape 1 Post Unit 8)

Both for the analyst and one participant, the pro, the assignment of meaning to this text is retrospective. Alone, 11-21 need not be an Enablement relation. 22, however, is a far more specific nucleus. The client specifies the status of the information he is passing on which he failed to do in the first half of the Solutionhood List relation. It is not only what goes before that allows for the understanding of what follows, in a discourse analytic sequential pattern. This process can also be reversed. What follows can allow for a retrospective coding of what went before. Especially because the talk in this section has all been monologic, with little in the way of interjection from the pro, aimed at elucidating the text's purpose. Furthermore, because the source of the text is not the speaker but another member of the client team, it means that no definite interpretation will have been put on this monolog until the above upshot / confirmation request sequence, initiated by the pro, determines its force.

Matching Relations

For the analyst there is added evidence to suggest that both halves of the Solutionhood nucleus are constructed with high level Enablement relations; there is the parallelism between the two parts; the repeated reference to John Nicholl's text and the low level List structures in both of the Enablement satellites. I think such parallel structuring is evidence of the construction of hierarchic text by speakers and of generic types of talk, and may also be available here to the pro as a means for her to decode the whole message.

The detail of the two Enablement satellites can be analysed in the following way. 12-13 is the elaboration nucleus of 12-21. 14-21 specifies what it is his fellow client has written. The interactive asides that accompany this listing will be dealt with shortly. The basic pattern here is for Ian to mention an item on the written list (14, 16, 17.5) and then to provide an explanatory gloss of his own, coded as Elaboration in 15 and 18-19. The latter is itself a contrast relation functioning as an Elaboration of 17a. 17 and 20-21 are attempts to code the more interpersonally oriented comments.

In the second Enablement satellite there is no Elaboration nucleus. The parallel structure that is building up and the clearer description of the status of the notes he is using make such an elaboration as was found in 12-21 unnecessary. This Enablement satellite does have the same kind of List structure however, 23-32. In 23-24 again we find 23 is the item from the notes and 24 is Ian's gloss or specification. 25-26 are also the notes and 26.5-29 is Ian's gloss. 30-32 is the text itself and at this point Suzanne seeks confirmation of its meaning for her. The RST analysis shows that the matching relations between the two List sections of the Solutionhood nucleus is almost identical.

We will see in other texts, particularly in Tape 12, that the top level relations are switchable. Here Enablement occurs within the Solutionhood satellite. The notes that enable the pro to produce good text for the client are the solution to the initial problem with this section of the text; that it isn't telling the reader anything specific to FT. It is also possible for the Enablement relation to have a Solutionhood relation embedded within. To what extent this switch can be identified with certain kinds of text or be seen as a major means of text creation will be followed up in the next chapter.

There are a number of asides made by Ian in this text, all of which serve to mitigate its force or authority. 17 is partly referring to the notes as a specific item `speed and temperature' but this is preceded by an interpersonal comment on these terms from Ian; `I don't know what he meant by . . .' 17.5 is first elaborated in 18-19 but then some negative assessment of the note is added by Ian in 20-21. Both these additions, I feel, are meant to soften the blow of having to do a rewrite, which Ian must be preparing to ask for, or perhaps he hopes that, as in fact happens, the pro will realise it for herself. These interpersonal additions also distance Ian from what is in the notes, allowing him to show some solidarity with his pro. It is Ian after all who has the face to face contact with the pro. It is easy for the absent client to leave a `brief' of what needs to be done. Ian is finding a way of passing on bad news that is not entirely of his making.

Jokes at the other client's expense are asides attached to the second Enablement span. These haven't been coded in that firstly, they are inessential to the organisation of the monologic text, and secondly, because they are not I think monologic but looking for laughter from the pro, emotional response, and some joining in in deciphering the bad writing. I think these jokes again serve to make the meaning of this text and of the notes themselves unclear. It is not until the pro has opened the interactive process of recovering the meaning of the past monolog for her that Ian has to concede the status of the notes and support his colleague and make an excuse for the poor quality of the notes while leaving their force as enabling change and being the clients' suggested solution for the problem in 1-10.

Suz	laugh [so is this all is this all got to be
Ian	[I've got to admit he he actually spent five] minutes on this] before he reviews somebody this afternoon.

(Tape 1, Post Unit 8)

Summary

In the two example texts from Tape 1 we have seen quite different dominant text organising relations to those found in Tape 4a. I hope in the next chapter to show that these differences are not arbitrary but that they are a key feature in the production of texts that function as these ones do, as core elements of briefing and draft review. If these dominant text relations reoccur in the technical writing data, and can be assigned a similar functional status to the units described above, then this is evidence that there is a generic connection between a public relations draft review or briefing and the same event in technical writing.

9.4 The Technical Writing Data

Technical Writing and Public Relations

This tape covers the first hour and a half of a briefing that lasted over a day. The technical writer is being introduced to a complicated computer program that provides an accounting system for Lloyds insurance syndicates and members' agencies. There is a great deal of detail to be gone through; about the workings of Lloyds, and the workings of the system. There is far more new information for the technical writer to become familiar with than was the case in Tape 4, where the designer was even told that she might think of those documents as being similar to other work she had done for Birmingham. The technical writer says he has done work on accounts packages before and encountered some of the problems that the clients feel might be particular to them. Problems, such as having a variety of different users for the system, which makes the production of a general manual difficult, and having a system in an ongoing state of development, which means that not only is it growing all the time in terms of function but that currently correct information in time becomes false. For Juliana it was important to know who the product was for, and what its aims were. She wasn't, however, being asked to write the text, which may well have meant a great deal more information in the briefing about Birmingham University and its areas of prestige. Juliana needs a feel for the kind of information that will be on each page so she can offer candidate designs to enforce the written message. Here the technical writer is having to learn a system for a professional area he is not familiar with, Lloyds of London, and then produce a manual that meets client specifications and which will be comprehensible and usable by new learners. We shall see especially in Tape 12 where a more senior client conducts the draft review, that although accuracy is important the need to present information in a persuasive way, that will encourage product purchase and advertise the power of the system is equally valued. Especially as what is accurate is changeable in this product, but the need to sell it, to show why it is better than its rivals, is constant. In this respect then the process has fundamental similarities with the public relations document design in tape 1. The major negative evaluation given to the pro's draft, found in RST Unit 8 for Tape 1 and discussed earlier in this chapter, was less on grounds of inaccuracy, such matters can be quickly corrected, but on the basis of not being persuasive; specifically of not including those points that separated the client company from its competitors.

There is then some reason to expect both similarity and differences in the interactive processes that are necessary to enable the production of documents in these two professional fields. One major difference, only partly captured by these recordings, is the length of the stages in technical writing. The draft review on Tape 1 was a brisk affair lasting thirty five minutes. On Tape 12 the client jokingly opens the meeting by telling the technical writer he will need at least two ninety minute tapes to capture it. The briefing on Derek's document in Tape 4a is again a brisk twenty minutes. It takes an hour or more to deal with Bob's in Tape 4b but this is still well short of the whole day plus that it took to complete the briefing process that Tape 7 is the opening ninety minutes of.

A second major difference, especially between the draft review texts is the amount of work that is done in monologic discourse. Tape 12 is predominantly monologic; Tape 1, in contrast, is the most interactive of the recorded meetings. Tape 7 is also much more monologic than Tape 4, so there is a consistency to the processes within each profession. Whereas then, the public relations data *has been* accessible through discourse analysis, this is much less the case for the technical writing data. The public relations recordings reveal generic characteristics in each of the three major types of interaction identified. These generic features are in terms of the different interaction patterns that occur in different types of meeting and which occur consistently both within any one meeting and across meetings of the same type.

I suspect that although such interactive differences will also be apparent in the technical writing data, beyond the recognition of basic patterns, which are predicted to show similarities with their public relations counterparts, I think the data will resist a discourse analytic approach and be more accessible to a Rhetorical Structure Analysis of the monologic sequences. That said, it is the aim of this analysis to uncover basic similarities in the process of document design across professional boundaries. It is hypothesised that there will be more in common in briefings or draft reviews, whether the client is a university or a computer software producer and whether the consultant is a pro, a designer or a technical writer, than there will be to separate them. There will be differences; this preference for monolog is one, and to a large degree these differences should be accountable for either in terms of the local conditions, contingent variables, or, when the differences are more constant, more systematic, then they should reflect professional differences in rhetoric and communicative practices.

RST and a Genre Based Approach

These chapters are a search for generic features of document design. Here, in Part 2 of this thesis, these features are to be illustrated through the application of rhetorical structure analysis to the technical writing data. Example analysis is available also of the public relations data so there is grounds for comparison in terms of monologic structure. The discourse analytic findings from Part 1 of this thesis can be used to help recognise typical recurrent locations in the technical writing data where different monologic text organisation is to be found. The process is still basically interactive; monolog is being produced to achieve a functional goal that is necessary to the communicative process of document design. I think by examining the way monologic stretches of discourse are received, accepted or challenged, the way they are brought to a close either by their recipient or their producer, will help reveal the interactive slot and the functional element that these monologs are either filling or replacing. This, coupled with an RST analysis of their semantic and pragmatic organisation should provide an alternative and complementary perspective on genre to that developed in Part One of this thesis. It will show genre characteristics of the separate stages of the document design process but less in terms of a sequence of optional and obligatory elements and with more emphasis on the typical meanings and their typical structuring within the different stages of document design.

By approaching genre through these two different linguistic types of analysis it is hoped to show that even what look like quite different ways of doing a briefing or a draft review do in fact belong to the same or at least to agnate genres. Genre analysis needs to be able to incorporate different ways of doing some activity, different ways of encoding and different ways of interacting, without losing sight of what is basically the same; that a similar social activity is being enacted with similar professional purposes. Genre characteristics therefore need to be explicated in terms of the necessary action that is required in order for a briefing or draft review to both take place and to be completable, and not to be too dependent on the presence of similar linguistic evidence.

The purpose of this chapter however is to examine basic commonly occurring rhetorical relations and to show how they function from the top of the hierarchy to the bottom. The above serves as an introduction to our first look at the technical writing data. The approach to genre outlined above however will only be returned to as a central issue in the following chapter.

9.5 Tape 7. The Technical Writing Briefing

Tape 7 RST Unit 2
Background

This section occurs half an hour or so into the talk. Present are Richard, the technical writer, and Martin, who is client services manager for Olympic Resources. He is the member of the client team doing the briefing. This is only their second meeting and this is the opening of the briefing. Earlier monologic stretches of discourse in this briefing are very background orientated - how the company originated, where its work force came form, and what its priority products are. Much of the information is requested by the technical writer who occasionally refers to his notes to see that areas he wanted covering as background are indeed being covered.[3]

Once that basic orientation has been done, the technical writer leads the meeting on to a discussion of the system that they are going to look at, and that he is going to write a manual for. Up to this point the client has done most of the talking, but the technical writer has done the directing; selecting areas of talk and choosing the right moment for his briefer to close one topic and open another.

As lead up text to this monolog we find the technical writer closing down what looks like the whole section of talk on a range of background issues.

M
108. so er we're not aiming at the bottom end of the

market.
109. It's being boarded up actually.
110. There are acquisitions going on all the time out there

R yes yes

M
111. obviously what tends to happen is that the little boy system gets swallowed up by by whoever's doing the taking over

R yeah. . [3] Ok, That gives me an impression of what you do, when you do... how long ..

M
112. and we offer er other things consultancies as well to a number of other agencies,
113. general services in terms of the actual software products, . . background

R yes

Close Unit 1A
=============================

M Do you want me to try and get a coffee before
. we er carry on before the next ??

R Could I have it black please

(Tape 7, RST Unit 1a plus)

Martin finishes talking about the market place and we see Richard acknowledge his reception of, and the sufficiency of the background information that he has received. Martin too appears to cooperate in bringing this section to a close, once the technical writer has indicated that it is sufficient for his purposes, and produces a boundary marker in the talk by offering a cup of coffee. It seems Martin is eager to provide the technical writer with information on as many background topics as the technical writer wants. He is content at this stage to let Richard organise his own relevant information collection system and to let him choose the topics.

On his return with coffee, Martin picks up on a background issue that Richard had raised but which had received scant response, that of company image. Having taken care of that, there is a four second pause in the talk. Neither Martin nor Richard have more to say about image; they have just agreed on what kind of image a company in this business requires. There is no more to be said and Richard again initiates a new subject for him to be briefed on. This time, moving away from background topics onto the system itself that he will write a manual for.

R   My next on the list of ??. Probably if you could now tell me something about the system we're going [to look at

M
1.   the investment] system [2] yeah.
2.   It's been it's been initially written to to serve the needs of syndicates at LLoyds

R   mm

(Tape 7a, RST Unit 2)

Richard has requested an introduction to the investment system and it is this that the client addresses in what is largely monolog over the next 77 clauses. With one exception, to be dealt with shortly, Richard's comments are reduced to acknowledgement or receipt markers; `mm', `right', `yes', `yeah' and `mm hmm', and confirmation requests, as in the following example.

M
10. yeah yeah. [3] So Basically the premiums are invested in stocks and shares really
11. and that's what the system is there to control

R   So it monitors where they are it keeps track of

M
12. yeah yeah erm it's got a sort of trading module

built into it
13. so you can actually trade.?
14. It's got a cash book system in there as well

R right
(Tape 7, RST Unit 2)

This is similar to the upshot confirmation requests we find Juliana making in Tape 4a and the pro making in Tape 1. It is not enough for the client to silently receive information; they need to check what they hear and that they are understanding it rightly. This feature of being a briefing recipient then is common across pr and technical writing and manifests itself as a constant discourse feature of a document design when something new is being passed between client and consultant. Viewed from the analyst's perspective it is a feature that provides basic interactional evidence that the sort of talk taking place is is at least in an agnate genre to those available to document design.

Midway through this stretch of talk, at a rhetorical structure boundary, there is a brief return to dialogic discourse. The client has just produced his Enablement satellite and looks to Richard to see the technical writer's response to the situation the client would like to see realised; a document that would match the needs of all types of user.

M
40. erm Once we are there we can then move chunks out of it. if you like
R yes
M
41. to produce a manual
42. perhaps me and yourselves
R yeah
M
43. erm to suit other other market places
R right erm

M
44. I don't know what if you have any suggestions on that.
R erm it can be done. There are ways of document documenting systems to allow just that really. We've written
M mmm
R quite a lot of documentation often where there are a number of different kind of users
M yeah
R =who have different expectations
M sure
R =and a different set of knowledge. So there are things that we can try and do to make that easier for you
M
45. See you can see, the actual look of the system in terms of someone looking at the screen looks different in both cases
R right
(Tape 7, RST Unit 2)

This interaction opens with the technical writer's uncertain yet positive response to the client's statement of his wishes for the document and ends with the opening of the client's Justification satellite for his assertion that the system has very different kinds of user. The interaction occurs then, not so much at a transition relevant point (Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson 1974), because the speaker who had the floor at that point broke off from his own talk to ask a question. More to the point for this analysis, the client broke off his monolog at a major transition point in its rhetorical organisation. This counts as more evidence that constructors of these long monologic turns are aware of the hierarchical structures they are building and of their overall function as they create them.

The monolog comes to an end once the client has justified his Enablement nucleus with the second Solution nucleus within the Justification relation. The technical writer isn't being asked to accept or assess the client's proposed solutions. After all, Richard has been employed because the company found themselves unable to adequately or economically solve their own documentation problems. He is being briefed, not directed. This is a similar point to one that is actually raised in Tape 4b. Frank makes it very clear that the purpose of the meeting is not to tell Juliana what to do.

F	DP	I would advise against at this stage tying anybody's hands, least of all Juliana's in saying there is a rule that on the cover we treat all images as photographs and not as illustrations.
	elab	Erm, we'll give her the task of making sure that they do link
J	ack	mm
F	cont	and they've got to obviously
J	acc	Oh they will link yes
F	DP	But let's not tell her how to do it I would suggest.
J	ag	yes

(Tape 4b, Unit 11)

Here we see I think the same relation that Frank wants between the client and designer taken for granted or tacitly enacted in the interaction that ends this monolog.

M	
74.	so that's what made me think well perhaps we ought to produce not not one manual to try and be general but maybe two separate ones
75.	although you just get probably pull part of it out,
76.	sounds like a different name then
R	yes. Something that I want to [certainly bear in mind
M	look at as you go through to see you may suggest, come up with some suggestions that will let us do it you know.
R	yes, so let's try and think
M	It would be nice if you could produce a general one but the more I thought about it the more difficult I thought it would be.

R That is, it can be a problem when people are using completely different vocabularies
M yes
R =to talk about the same things
M it's the same it's the same blasted product
R yeah [laugh]
M That's right at the end of the day they look at it in a different way . . . . [3]

Close Unit 2

==============================

Open Unit 3

R erm start bringing us on to what sort of people use the product?

(Tape 7, RST Units 2-3)

Richard's response to Martin's solution is to acknowledge it as something to 'bear in mind'. This is what briefing units should provide. I do not think Martin constructs his solution as a decision proposal, in discourse analytic terms, and Richard certainly doesn't respond to it as one. Martin is only concerned to put the problem on the agenda; so Richard might come up with some suggestions. Again this matches the interactional rules that the pro lays down in the quote above from Tape 4b. The Birmingham client team know they want the documents to relate through the design. They have passed that information on to Juliana for her 'to bear in mind'. How she does it, and how Richard does it are for them to come up with suggestions for. Suggestions which eventually may form part of a presentation or a draft review for assessment by the client team.

Topic Type Analysis

Having passed the background stage typical semantic patterns belonging to a briefing start to occur. Viewed from a Florence Davies text type perspective (Davies and Greene 1984) the necessary constituents of a briefing are contained in answering questions such as the following.

What is there?
What are its parts?
What does it do?
How do you use it?
What are you hoping to do with it?
What is its place in the system?

If some combination of these questions is being addressed and we are somewhere in document design, then it is likely that we are either fully in a briefing meeting or we are going through a briefing stage within a different meeting type. Examples of this will be evident when we address the data in Tape 12. If these stages recur frequently then we are almost certainly in a briefing meeting. I am not suggesting that participants necessarily orientate to working within such a framework, but from an analyst's perspective recognition that the data is filling these semantic slots and by and large only these slots is another genre indicating element. This feature is not discoursal or even monologic but a matter of content; of semantics. More will be said on the application of Florence Davies' work on text types to this document design data in the following chapter.

RST Analysis of Tape 7 Unit 2

Key Relations
Enablement, Solutionhood, Justification.

The top level relationship in this stretch of data is one of Enablement. The text functions, as outlined above, to enable the technical writer to address the issues that the client wants addressed. There are Solutionhood relations within the Enablement nucleus and within the Justification satellite but these are organised within what is fundamentally Enablement text. The client is producing some text in a Problem - Solution pattern but the Solutionhood nuclei do not function as decision proposals. They are solutions in the eyes of the client, presented to allow the technical writer to do his job for the client. It is this function that is carried by the top level Enablement relation, hierarchically superior to the Solutionhood relations.

This can be compared to RST Unit 8 in Tape 1 where there is top level Solutionhood and Enablement within the Solution nucleus. The emphasis there is on providing a solution to the draft text problem. The notes that have been written enable this Solution and do function as a decision proposal from the client team to the pro. The example to follow from Tape 12 provides an example of Enablement functioning as a top level relation in a draft review context. In that instance, the Enablement relation does carry a decision proposal, but the nucleus carries an issue that can be considered a company value, rather than specific instructions on how to improve the text. It is these different meanings and different emphases that determine top level relations, especially of a pragmatic nature, in these monologic stretches of document design talk.

The Enablement Satellite

The Enablement satellite comes first. It is in this section that the client gives some specific details of the investment system. It is this part of the monolog that fits the Florence Davies topic type grid for briefing information. 1 could be seen as the issue which the rest of the text elaborates. This however would give elaboration too central a role for this text and I choose to see 1 as an acquiescent response to Richard's request for this information on the system, and to start the analysis from 2. In other words 1 is part of the interaction that sets up the monolog that develops from 2 onwards. The satellite consists of two parts in a Contrast relation; 2-15, is contrasted by Martin with 16 - 25.

The first part is in a List relation in two halves; 2-11 and 12-15. List is a dominant relation in Tape 4a. It occurs here too as a way of organising information into sections, but has a less key role to play at least in the organisation of this sample text. 2 answers the briefing question 'what does it do?' and 3-11 elaborate on this answer by describing the investment system at Lloyds as practiced by the syndicates. 3-4 is the nucleus of this Elaboration and 4 is an embedded Elaboration of 3. 5-9 describes the purpose of the activity in 3-4, the investment of income in stocks and shares. The nucleus of the purpose satellite is 5. The purpose of the investment is to earn some money. 6 is one piece of Elaboration on 5. It gives a technical word for this earned money, collateral. 7-9 is another piece of Elaboration, providing information on what happens to this money. Again, as we typically found in Tape 4a, in briefing information organised under a List structure, there is often a Summary or Restatement relation. It adds the part that the system can play in this investment process.

12-15 specifies two parts of the system and their particular purposes, thus answering the briefing questions `What are its parts?' and `What does it do?'. 12 names the part and 13 gives its purpose while 14-15 names another part and its purpose. Again we find matching relations under List organised text in a briefing, suggesting control and purpose in the construction of the hierarchic text structure.

16-26 is in a loose contrasting relationship with what has gone before. The nuclei, 2 and 16-17, contrast. The rest of each part of the Contrast relations provide the necessary briefing information on these issues, which have really only been presented as a contrasting structure rather than to provide a real Contrast between the two purposes of the system. 16-17 is the nucleus of the second strand of the Contrast relation and this is elaborated in 18-25, where commercial interests outside the insurance market are specified. This second part of the contrast structure answers a different question to the first; `What are you hoping to do with it [the system]?'. Rather than focus on the parts and uses of the system as in 2 - 15, this section details Olympic's uses for the system as a commercial product. The opening phrase of 17 `having said that' might be expected to lead into a Concession relation. I have decided, as stated in the introductory chapter on RST, not to be guided by lexical signals unless the clause relation between the adjacent pieces of text would function even without the lexical marker. In this case I don't think it would. I don't think Martin is trying to concede the information in 2-15 in any way. According to Stewart

> In a CONCESSION relation the speaker admits the truth or possibility of the truth of material contained in the satellite text span which is potentially damaging to the acceptance of the material presented in the nuclear span.
> (Stewart 87, p.224)

There is no such rhetorical weighting here. All I think `having said that' signals is the need to recall nucleus clause 2 in order to interpret up and coming nucleus 17-18. It is a discourse chunking device for the speaker as he constructs his text and to aid the listener in knowing which bits of information most closely hang together and need to be understood in the light of one another in the process of decoding.

18-26 is a List structure in two parts that provides the Elaboration satellite to the nucleus 16-17. 18 just specifies private client trading and 19-26 specifies members' agencies and then structures more information about this kind of user. 20-26 provides a Reason why members' agencies have need of an investment system. 20 -21 is the nucleus of this Reason satellite, with 21 a Purpose satellite to 20.

22-26 provides the Result of the situation presented in 20. This is a quite common co-occurrence of relations; Reason and Result. It seems a common and practical way of providing an explanation of something. X can do something because of y. The result of y is z. Information in both y and z have increased one's understanding of x. 22-23 is the nucleus of this Result satellite, with 24-26 in a Means relation with it. This Means relation explains how members' agencies get stocks and shares. 26 is the nucleus, and 24-25, which are in a Disjunct relation with each other, an OR relation are in a relation of Antithesis to 26.

An Antithesis relation is a special contrast relation that commits the speaker to only one side of the contrast which is the nucleus. Here the speaker is committed to 26; that however the shares are procured, it is under the agency's control. 24 and 25 offer alternative means of procurement, neither of which is invested with the speaker's commitment. At a higher level Antithesis can be an important persuasive relation and it regularly occurs at mid levels in Enablement and Solutionhood relations. It also occurs at these low levels where there is no overall text organising power in it; it simply becomes a means by which the speaker can show his attitude or commitment even to elements of text structure not presented as being of key importance. The Enablement satellite is brought to a close with a brief summary of the main areas of the client's concern.

The Enablement Nucleus

The rest of this monolog is seen as the Enablement nucleus. It splits into two main parts; the nucleus itself 30-43 and a Justification satellite 45-76. I will deal first with the nucleus. In this part of the text, having described certain features of the system in a way that answers the questions a brief should answer, the client now talks about what he wants or hopes the collaboration with a professional technical writer will bring about.

M
30. yeah I was trying to run this thing over in my head
31. and see if we could try and come up with something that was perhaps general
R mmm
M
33. =that could match both
34. well certainly the managing and the members' agency links
R yes
M
35. which would have been nice.
36. Having said that erm
37. the two sets of people tend to treat the whole thing so differently in terminology and so on and so forth
R yes
M
38. I thought that might be difficult.
39. Perhaps if we put the emphasis on producing a manual for the for the syndicate investments
R mm
(Tape 7, RST Unit 2)

The focus has changed from providing briefing information units on the system to be documented, to discussing possible solutions to the problems the client wants solved, or at least addressed, by the technical writer; namely how to write a manual for multiple users with a range of different interests. The Enablement nucleus therefore consists of a second level Solutionhood relation. Martin puts forward the problem and his solution, not, as I said, as a decision proposal but as a means of demonstrating to the pro the issues he wants addressed. 30-38 is that part of the situation seen as requiring a solution and 39 - 43 is the Solutionhood nucleus. The nucleus of the Problem satellite is 30 - 34, while 35 - 38 offers an Assessment of the part of the situation that requires a solution. Not surprisingly, that Assessment is negative. It seems to be an essential feature that where an Assessment relation forms part of the Solutionhood relation satellite, that Assessment will be negative. Otherwise there would not be a Problem. When an Assessment relation occurs within the Solutionhood nucleus, however, it is likely to be positive.

The Problem nucleus itself splits into a nucleus 31-2 with a satellite relation 33-34. 30 is coded as Circumstantial; it gives an orientation, a kind of location to the material to be presented in the nucleus. 33-34 specifies what `general' means in the present context. At this stage the technical writer knows what it is that he will be expected to consider when he writes his brief. It obviously isn't enough just to explain the system in clear concise language. He is expected to take the range of users into account. Just as for Juliana's design work, it wasn't going to be sufficient to produce a design that would present the text in a clear concise way. The audience needed to be taken into account and the design managed and conceived to persuade all the right people of all the right intangible qualities of Birmingham University. The case is the same with the technical writer. He may on one level be being asked to produce text that will make what is complicated clear to the novice user, but that is not all. He has to produce recipient designed text; with the recipients defined by the clients' wishes. This point becomes clearer in Tape 12 but this is a good example of briefings doing more than just answering the kind of topic type questions listed above. The technical writer has to take the client's perception of what is a problem into account. It is this pragmatic or interpersonal element of a briefing that is encoded in RST as high level Enablement relations and Solutionhood relations. In Chapter 10 the texts that are organised around these relations will be looked at more closely and more will be said on this aspect of document design that couples persuasion with the production of clear information.

35-38 is the Assessment. This time `having said that' does signal a Concession. The client clearly is contrasting two possible assessments of the situation and attaching commitment only to one, that which is presented last, in 36-38. 35 then is a Concession satellite to 36-38. 38 is the nucleus and 36 -37 provide a Reason for this nucleus.

This is text that is designed to do more than simply inform the technical writer. The expected briefing units are to be found in the Enablement satellite. The top level organisation of the text, however, uses this as necessary information which is imparted in order to bring about the situation expressed in the nucleus. Namely in this instance, that the problem caused by multiple sets of different users be addressed by the writer. In this Enablement nucleus which, if it is not meant to persuade is at least meant to draw the technical writer's attention to issues he must address in the course of his writing, we find an embedded Solutionhood relation in the problem part of which there is a negative Assessment, a Condition and a Reason relation. It is these relations and the combinations of these relations in one hierarchy or another that provides a key site for recognising genre specific monolog types in this document design data.

The Solutionhood nucleus comprises clauses 39 - 43. 39 is a Conditional relation to the rest. It is marked by an `if' clause and the word `perhaps' increases the tentativity of the solution. The client isn't telling the technical writer what the solution is; he puts forward his own idea as information for the technical writer to notice and take account of. 42 provides background information for making sense of the rest of the information provided in this nucleus. The nucleus of the Solutionhood nucleus is 40 -41. This is the client's present solution to the problem. 43 elaborates by specifying who the second manual would be addressed to. 44 isn't coded and leads temporarily out of the monolog as described in the introduction to this analysis.

The Justification Relation

Once Richard has suggested that there are ways of handling multiple users in doing documentation, and that he has experience of just that, Martin takes the floor back to continue his monolog with a new major relation; that of providing a Justification for the problematic nature of the situation he has described in the Enablement nucleus.

Justify is a relation that takes a number of forms. Stewart defines it as follows.

> In a JUSTIFY relation the satellite text span attempts to establish the appropriateness or right of the speaker to put forth the claims made or action in the other part, such that the acceptance of the JUSTIFY satellite by the listener increases her or his acceptance of the nucleus.
> (Stewart 87, p.240)

Such a definition allows a fair deal of scope in the range of clause relations that may be described as JUSTIFY. I have already used it in the tape 4a example to account for the relation in Derek's text between the information he uses to brief Juliana and the status of that information, its familiarity and acceptability to the pro, Frank. The example here is a more complicated kind of Justify, although as part of a briefing, its purpose can still be described as accounting for the status of the information that is being passed on. The client is partly providing evidence from the screen that the system is different for different sets of users. However this text as a whole does more than just give Evidence, which Stewart's definition states is `usually factual data' (Stewart 87, p.237). Apart from appealing to what is on the screen, the client is still persuading the technical writer that the situation described in the Enablement nucleus is one that he must pay attention to in his writing. It is for this reason that this Justification satellite is included as part of the Enablement nucleus that forms a top level relation with the more typical briefing information given in the Enablement satellite. The Justify relation is a second level relation within the Enablement nucleus. By a number of means, apart from supplying Evidence, the function of this satellite of text is to ensure that Richard recognises the importance to the company of the information regarding the problem of different users that is presented in the Enablement nucleus.

In detail, this span provides three separately organised pieces of information to justify the client's wish that this problem area should be addressed by the technical writer. These three sections increase in length, and I think in quality, as Justification. 45 uses the physical evidence of what is presently on the screen to show differences between users. 46-56 is a difficult piece of text to analyse. I am left thinking it doesn't fit very well. This is either due to my failings, I might have got it wrong, or more positively it is because it isn't actually a very well formed piece of text and this shows up in the rhetorical structure analysis. Its overall function is unclear and consequently the relation between the parts is also unclear. The best analysis I can offer is as follows.

53-56 is the nucleus, this is the information that the client is leading up to and prepares for with a Background satellite 46-52 that itself has a Background satellite embedded within it 46-49. This lowest level Background relation consists of a List relation 46-47 and 48-49. 46-47 is an Elaboration relation. 46 introduces another product and 47 gives specific information on what it does. 48-49 is a Means relation. It explains what users can do in the nucleus 48, and how in 49. 50-52 explains how it is they can do these things with the other programme; it is by means of the supplied manual. This is the point I think the client wants to make and the preceding information is necessary preparation to understanding it. The background has only referred to what the users can do. Now the client is taking the credit, by means of the supplied manual. This nucleus of the Background relation is a Result relation. 50 tells what the client does and 51-52 gives the Result; what the client can do with this manual.

Matching Relations

The nucleus of this section of the Justify text is 53-56. This also is in a Result relation. In fact it is the clear Result relation here that for me, as an analyst, highlighted the Result relation in the preceding background nucleus. Again we find matching rhetorical relations occurring in parts of texts whose top level organisation, here the Justify satellite of an Enablement text, are persuasive. 53-54 is the suggested action to be taken, and 55-56 are the expected consequences of it. There is a matching relation between this nucleus and the background satellite. Indeed it is the presence of this matching relation that gives some sense to this stretch of text which is otherwise, I feel, quite unsuccessful. In the nucleus the client has now stopped talking about the other program that the users can work for themselves, and is drawing the comparison between their use of that system and how they will respond to a manual for this system. These relations are not clear in the text; this is no more than a candidate analysis of the client's intentions. Having supplied a real Result relation for another program, the client now supplies a Result relation of a similar nature for this programme. The matching client action of supplying documentation is in 53-54. The condition relation of 54, and again in 55, mark the change from what did happen to the hypothetical. 55-56 then matches the result of the client action in 51-52; they will have something to refer to whether they want to customise their system or not. This is the analysis; and I contend that the degree to which it seems unsatisfactory or not, to fully account for meaning in this section of text, is the extent to which this text itself is not fully functional. I suspect the client is making sense to himself, taking short cuts in his logic and not making much sense at this point to the technical writer. Richard's options are to seek clarification, which he doesn't do, or else to let the monolog continue and hope that the whole thing makes sense by the end. This is his selection.

The third part of this List relation, 57-76, consists of two Solutionhood relations, themselves in a List relation. The reason why these two pieces of text, 57-64 and 65-76, are seen as constituting one part of the higher level List is that they have this matching Solutionhood structure and that both justify by highlighting differences in the members' agency system and the syndicate system. This returns to the style begun in 45, the opening list element, which was lost in next section 46-56.

In the first of these Solutionhood relations the nucleus is 63-64. The aspect of the situation requiring a solution, the satellite, is 57-62. This is in a Contrast relation; contrasting the two user systems. 58 provides the Circumstances in which 57 is true. What is described in 57-58 is what is on the screen both men are looking at. The Contrast, 59-62, opens with a Condition relation, 59-60, because this screen is not being looked at. 59-60 is itself a List relation. 61-62 is the nucleus of this part of the Contrast. 61 is nuclear here and 62 provides a reason in support.

63-64 provides the Solution to this problem as taken by the client when he attempted to design a manual. 63 is the nucleus and 64 provides a Reason in support of his action. Again, it needs to be said that this is not presented as the solution that the client should adopt. The Solutionhood relation is part of the realisation of the higher level Justification, that is the organisation principle for this whole stretch of text from 45 to 77. That said, the Solutionhood nucleus for the second instance does seem to function as a nucleus for the whole Justify stretch of text. I don't see how this can be coded more accurately, however, and have left it as the Solutionhood nucleus. It does however provide a point at which the technical writer can give the necessary interactive response to everything he has heard in the previous 77 clauses of monolog.

65 I have coded as Background. It functions I think as meta language to indicate that the client still has more Evidence to build up his Justification. The problem is in two parts as a List relation. The first part 66-69 is a Contrast structure as we saw in the first Solutionhood text. It doesn't contrast on the basis of visual evidence this time, but in terms of how the two different user groups trade. 69 is in a Result relation with 66-68, presenting the resulting problem in the situation just described. The second part of the problem is not obviously

related to the first but the solution offered is the same. It presents a hypothetical problem situation of how one user group would react to finding information for another user group in its manual. The hypotheticality is marked by the condition relation between 70 and the rest of this Problem satellite, 71-73. 71 is the nucleus and 72-73 provide support, a Reason why this problem would occur.

Closure

The Solutionhood nucleus to both these problems, and as I say, functioning as enough of an overall nucleus to this Justification to lead into the close down of the monolog, is 74-76. 74 is the client's Solution. His thoughts on the matter now. He'd like one manual but perhaps it will take two. 75-76 is a Concession relation; suggesting that yes there will be two manuals but the second one might only be a pull out part of the first. 76 is in a Result relation with 75 within this concessive satellite. At this point Richard provides the response to all this monolog that I believe is no less than the response desired by the client.

M
74. so that's what made me think well perhaps we ought to produce not not one manual to try and be general but maybe two separate ones
75. although you just get probably pull part of it out,
76. sounds like a different name then
R yes. Something that I want to [certainly bear in mind
M look at as you go through to see you may suggest, come up with some suggestions that will let us do it you know.
R yes, so let's try and think
M It would be nice if you could produce a general one but the more I thought about it the more

difficult I thought it would be.

R That is, it can be a problem when people are using completely different vocabularies

M yes

R =to talk about the same things

M it's the same it's the same blasted product

R yeah [laugh]

M That's right at the end of the day they look at it in a different way . . . . [3]

Close Unit 2

==========================

Open Unit 3

R erm start bringing us on to what sort of people use the product?

(Tape 7 RST Units 2-3)

Richard will 'bear in mind' what he has been told. He isn't to treat it as a proposal for him to argue with, or as a preestablished solution for him to conform with. It is information for him to pay attention to and the client has gone to great lengths to improve the chances of this piece of information playing a part in the technical writer's approach to the text. Martin's response to Richard, now that interaction has temporarily been reestablished, functions as an assurance that Richard is responding to this brief as the client would wish; that the generic purpose of producing the text has been attended to by its recipient.

The ensuing interaction is marked by agreement and by both participants making evaluative comments based on the content of the monolog. These comments are not evaluative of the monolog, but are safe comments based on a shared view of the situation as presented in the monolog that allow for the expression of agreement between client and technical writer. In Tape 1, I think due to their lengthy working relationship, something similar is accomplished by going off topic for a while; by leaving the concerns of the task in hand and talking about something else over which there is no need for dispute; safe topics producing idle chatter. Here in Tape 7 the joint production of this interaction at the close of the monolog functions I believe to mark the successful completion of a section of work talk. It is a temporary break from the work of providing information, receiving information and establishing the status of this information.

9.6 Tape 12. The Technical Writing Draft Review

Introduction

The figures in the introduction to Chapter 10 indicate the sheer quantity of monolog in these technical writing recordings. Tape 12 is as full of it as Tape 7. Tape 7a has the highest mean length and the highest rate of occurrence; detailed suggestions why will be offered in Chapter 10, but my starting hypothesis is that briefing is more likely to produce monolog than draft review. In the public relations data there is far more monologic text in the briefing than the draft check. Briefing occurs at an early stage of the document design process and involves the transfer of information in a largely one way direction. We have seen already that a briefing may well consist of more than this; in RST terms this will show up as a need for text organised in Enablement relations rather than just in List structures.

Draft reviews are inherently likely to involve two way information exchange. The client has problems with the text and requires change, the writer must explain the text to overcome misunderstanding and on occasion justify her text against client criticism. The first reason why there is so much more monolog in Tape 12 than Tape 1 is due to the occurrence of briefing like behaviour in Tape 12. Arguably the original briefing was not totally successful. I have access neither to the draft text produced by the technical writer nor to the whole of the briefing so this can only be supposition. In Tape 12 the company manager spends a great deal of this meeting, not discussing problems with the text so much as omissions; problems possibly caused by a substandard briefing. In any case, it is a problem solved by producing briefing like monolog. Evaluative text analysis using RST will be pursued in more detail in the final chapter of this thesis.

In the example texts for Tape 12 I shall show one example of draft review text, and show similarities between it and the draft review activity in Tape 1. My second example will be a text that has more similarities with Tape 7. I shall also suggest that there are important differences between the briefing in Tape 7 and the briefing behaviour in Tape 12, that can be identified through RST analysis, which indicate that the briefing in Tape 12 is likely to be more successful.

Tape 12 RST Unit 4

Background

This unit occurs some 10 minutes into the data. The talk has opened with the client setting some of the parameters for what is to follow. He details reasons why there will yet be changes to the system. There are inconsistencies in Olympic's coding practices and there are developments to the system, increases in its power, that will involve changes being made. This is information that the client provides, much as if he were kicking off a briefing and supplying not the nitty gritty details but the features of the system that the client wants the technical writer to frame his text around.

There then follows, between RST units 3 and 4, the first negative evaluation of the draft text and it is in terms of a feature of the system, its tailorability, that the client wants emphasising and the pro has not covered. In this section we find some altercation between the two clients. In Tape 4b Frank had something of a fight with Bob in order to produce usable briefing material for Juliana. In this meeting a brief has been completed and in the draft review the two clients disagree on where this tailorability issue should be placed. Given that the client now handling the communication with the technical writer is Martin's boss, there is every likelihood that his views will prevail. What we find here is negative evaluation of the text provided and responded to by the technical writer in a short interactive sequence, followed up by Martin supporting the technical writer's answer, to put tailorability in a section of its own. Martin specifies that this section could be an appendix and it is just this issue that Tom, the manager takes issue with. The text he produces, then, is aimed at both Martin and Richard. At times Martin is viewed as co-responsible for the draft's failings, although at other times he also provides some critiquing of the text. Here Tom takes issue with what Martin says, his text has to be aimed at Martin therefore. It is also text for the technical writer's ears; to show him why a focus on this tailorability issue is important. This is what Tom does, that Martin didn't do. He provides reasons why an aspect of the system is important to the company. We saw that Martin did emphasise a problem that he wanted the technical writer to consider, that of multiple users with different view points. In this text, however, Tom focuses on saleable aspects of the company. He is focusing on what makes this product good; on what might separate it from others on the market.

This monolog fills the discourse slot for an alternative decision proposal. It opened with an implicit negative evaluation of Richard's text. This is responded to by Richard with a decision proposal, to cover the tailorability issue in an appendix. This is in the text immediately prior to RST Unit 4. This proposal gains support from Martin. The monolog that follows, Unit 4, is Tom's reject of this DP, plus support for his own DP to place this information in a place where it will receive attention. At the close of the monolog we find acceptance of what Tom has said from Martin, and a decision proposal from him that is not taken issue with, so one can assume it is accepted by all.

M yeah, include that as some sort of section.
(Tape 12, Unit 4)

This is then followed by a pause, that serves as group acceptance of this outcome, and then Martin raises another issue in the draft review. One can see that even a monolog such as this, 38 clauses, can be assigned a discourse slot. It is important to recognise two points here. First, that it is the interaction that moves the process on. Martin's acceptance of his boss's position means that the `decision proposal reject + alt DP + support' discourse move produced by Tom has had a successful outcome, and this decisioning routine can close and another be opened. Secondly, that a label such as `DP reject + support' can hide as much as it reveals when the time taken to produce such an interactive slot is 38 clauses. The discourse terminology highlights the regularity of sequential elements. RST analysis draws attention to what it is that can function as this discourse move. RST is an entry point to the semantics of discourse structure; to the meaning relations in text that allow it to function in ongoing talk the way that it does. Discourse analysis provides the means for seeing large scale interactive structure in the activity from more than one person's perspective. Discourse analysis allows one to see how the structures of monolog that are produced function as part of an interactive process. The two kinds of analysis are fully complementary with one another.

The interdependence of these types of analysis is perhaps most obvious in an activity such as the draft review in Tape 12; one that requires interaction. As we saw in Tape 1, draft review can in fact be achieved with very little monolog at all. Here, however, monolog is prevalent but the discourse framework for the activity; a framework shared by Tape 12 and Tape 1, but not by Tapes 4 or 7, is clearly evident.

RST Analysis of Unit 4

The top level relation here is one of Comparison. 1-16 is about tailorability and its place in the system and the manual. 17-38 is about security and its place in the system and in the manual. It is within these two spans at the next organising level down, that the important rhetorical structuring of this proposal making and supporting text is to be found. Both halves of this Compare structure have a high level Justify relation. We have seen this relation occupy an important organisational position in two texts already. In Tape 4a Derek used it to account for the status of the information that he was supplying to Juliana and Martin used it, in a different way in Tape 7, to support the top level Enablement relation that he was making in the briefing. The relation functions quite similarly here. This text, in the first half of the Compare structure, has an Enablement nucleus and then within that nucleus, just as in the example from Tape 7, the Justify relation is the top level of rhetorical structure. In Tape 7 the desired situation was less clearly defined and required a fuller Enablement nucleus to contain it. The Justification there consisted of screen evidence and other reasons why the system users were so different. Here, the desired situation is put more clearly and presented, not as a problem that the writer should be aware of, but as company policy to make its strengths apparent in its documentation.

Key Relations
Enablement & Justification

In the first part of this monolog then, the part that deals with tailorability as a positive feature of the system on sale, the top level relation is of Enablement with a Justify relation within the Enablement nucleus. This is a replica then of the top level organisation of Unit 2 in Tape 7. Within this similarity however it is possible to recognise differences in the two activities. The Enablement satellite in the two texts is quite different. Here, (1-7) it consists of a specific act; putting the notion of tailorability up front. There is a specific path to achieving the desired situation that is described in the nucleus, 8-16, a decision proposal in fact. In the Tape 7 example, however, the Enablement satellite consists of information that fits the semantic topic type grid I have constructed, on the Davies model, for doing a briefing. It is all information that answers questions such as `what is it?', `what does it do?', and `how can I use it?'. The interactive result of this Enablement - Justify text in Tape 7 is that Richard bears what the client says `in mind' when he approaches his writing task. Here in Tape 12 the interactive outcome is an acceptance of Tom's proposal to give tailorability its own section, and not to consign it to an appendix. Draft review text leads to decisions being taken, the upshot of a briefing need be no more than points to consider.

The Enablement satellite 1-7 comes first. 1-5 is the nuclear element of this stretch of text. This is where the specific proposal is to be found that functions to both reject Martin and Richard's DP and as an Alt DP itself. 6-7 is a Reason relation that functions to support the proposal. 1-5 is produced in response to a concession being made by Martin that Tom clearly doesn't feel goes far enough. The monolog takes account of Martin's comments, as can be seen from the two Antithetical relations, 2 and 4, in this proposal nucleus. In 2 Martin's words appear in the Antithesis satellite, which shows the view that contrasts with the speaker's own. In 4 he counters potential objections to what he is saying. He makes clear that he does not want to force this on readers, what he wants is to make them want to read it, which would not be the case if the text were only in an appendix, and this point is made in the reason satellite 6-7.

The Enablement nucleus is from 8-16 with 8-12 being the nucleus and 13-16 being the Justification for it. Again we find the Antithesis relation occurring in an important rhetorical position. This is persuasive text - in a broad sense of the term. It is text designed to influence action. In texts of this nature where views and opposing views are contrasted we are very likely to find Antithesis as a text structuring relation. 8-9 is in an antithetical relation with 10-12. This is the relation at the heart of the Enablement nucleus of this text. The point of the proposal in the satellite 1-7 is to bring about this state of affairs. Tom wants the users to know the power of their software, the main point in 8-9, and not for them just to be told what it does. This latter possibility, not favoured by the client, is put in the Antithesis satellite 10-12.

13-16 is the client's Justification of this position. 13 presents the hypothetical situation, that can be achieved by writing this manual in a suitable way; one that will give the client a sense of the system's flexibility. 14-16 then present the likely consequences of that hypothetical situation. This is organised in a two part List relation. 14 is one Consequence and 15-16 another, in which 16 is circumstantial to 15.

The second half of the top level Compare relation deals with another topic that the client wants treated similarly; that of security. 17 introduces the item and makes the claim that it is as important an issue as tailorability. I think that the Compare relation is an important one in this monolog. A case for giving tailorability a high documentation profile has just been made and by using a Compare structure, those same arguments carry over into this section of text on security. I see the rest of the text (18-34) as a top level relation of Justification for seeing security in this light and hence, carrying over the rhetorical force of the first section of this Compare relation. This means that the Enablement relation at the heart of the first stretch of text continues to apply to this second part through the comparison relation. In this way a matching relation for the two sections of this text can be sen to hold; both have a top level Enablement relation within which the next top level structure is one of Justification.

Key Relations in Part Two of the Comparison Span. Justification, Assessment and Restatement

18-20 is the nucleus of the Justification relation. It is elaborated by specification in 21 - 26. 18-20 is a two part List relation; 18 and 19-20. I think what Tom wants to say at this point about security is still a little unclear. It may well be a feature of spoken text in monolog that one sees the achievement of structure and function in a text as it develops, whereas a written text has the potential at least to demonstrate organisation as a finished text.

At this point there is then a piece of interaction which serves to correct the misuse of a term by Tom. Martin's doing this to his boss might seem odd but in the context of providing the means for Richard to document the system it is clearly important that he gets all the terminology right.

22-26 then specifies and makes clear what Tom starts to say in 18-20. It gives a specification for 'totally in control'. 22 is itself the nucleus of this Elaboration and 23-26 is in an Elaboration relation with it. Embedded Elaboration is quite a commonly occurring feature in these texts, especially the technical writing ones where it functions as explanation of part of the process. 23-24 and 25-26 are in an AND relation, and 25-26 is itself in an OR relation. The whole Elaboration serves to exemplify the power of the security part of the system.

Having given an example then of a feature of the security function, the client then assesses this feature. The Assessment is positive, as one would expect in support of an issue that the client wants high profiling in the documentation. The Assessment is in 27-31. Its nucleus is 27-31. 27 is the general Assessment and 28-31 is an Elaboration by specification of this point. 28-31 are all in an OR relationship; another example of a Disjunct with more than two elements. 32-34 is a Restate relation.

It picks up just one key feature of the Justification satellite, which is to prove the relation between tailorability and securities.

A Summary relation like this can function to end a turn and Martin seems to pick up this signal and assumes that Tom has finished talking, having made his point, by proving the link between tailorability and security. Martin produces the DP accept comment and starts to add some related information on securities, directed at and acknowledged by Richard. In 35 we see Tom retake the floor, quite aggressively. He clearly hadn't finished his turn, which contains information that he values highly.

35 -38 I take as a Restatement of the whole point Tom is making about security. The previous one focused on the link with tailorability, whereas this one focuses more generally on the positive features of the security system. Restatement not only signals possible closure but has its own function as a feature of persuasive text; to get main points that may have been obscured by the detail of the talk clearly across to those who should be persuaded and in this instance accept the client's alternative decision proposal.

RST Analysis of Unit 13

The previous section showed a top level Enablement relation functioning in a draft review text. In the following example the draft review activity is uncomplicated and is structured as a pair of matching Solutionhood relations. In the previous example there was no text to repair. There was an item missing that the client thought of key importance. The structuring of his talk did not function simply to say 'tailorability is missing from this text, you must put it in'. Such a text would have had a problem - solution structure. Rather in Unit 4 the client said what he wanted to see in the document, an upfront position for the tailorability and security issues, and then proceeded to give the company rationale as to why this should be done. The positioning of the text on tailorability then becomes a means of enabling this key feature, that users should 'have some appreciation of the power of the software they are working with'. There is more going on here than mundane text correction. The client is being provided with a rational framework, a company rhetoric on which to build his text. More will be made of this issue in the final chapter but it needs to be introduced here to account for the different functional emphasis when the draft review activity is performed in text organised in an Enablement relation, in comparison to text, as in Unit 13, which is organised in a Solutionhood relation.

Draft Review Text with a Top Level Solutionhood Relation

Solutionhood is the high level text relation that is most indicative of draft review text, that separates draft review from a briefing. We have seen in Tape 4b that a briefing can have Solutionhood discourse in it, but when this occurs, something other than straightforward briefing activity is going on. Something which in Tape 4b can be accounted for by the pro briefing the designer of Bob's document before he and Bob had had occasion to discuss the first draft of the text.

Key Relation
Solutionhood

This is a small span of text occurring some 35 minutes into the data. The established pattern of the discourse at this point is for the client to either negatively evaluate some text or else to find something that should be covered, omitted. Both these types of activity can be constructed by the client using either a Solutionhood text relation and or an Enablement relation. In Unit 13 the relation most apparent is Solutionhood. Above it there is a List relation. Whereas List relations in briefings, at this high level of structure have structures beneath them of Elaboration, Reason and Purpose, they do not contain Solutionhood relations. In this way we can see how RST analysis can reveal generic text features. It is not necessarily the occurrence of any one relation that can be thought generic, or even the occurrence of any one relation at a high or mid level. Rather it is through likely co-occurrences and functional restriction of co-occurrences that will be RST's contribution to a genre analysis of these documentation activities.

What the List relation in this text does is highlight the matching relation between the two short pieces of text that comprise this monolog. The matching relation. is also a candidate marker of generically constructed text. It indicates a way of doing an activity in language that is immediately repeatable. Earlier, we have seen matching relations as being persuasive; functioning to make speaker meaning accessible to the listener and investing the message with value, due to this matching style of construction. Here the matching is of two separate acts of evaluating and proposal making, that the client rapidly produces in response to the technical writer's first draft and to his own notes.

1-8 is the first Solutionhood relation. 1-4 is that part of the situation requiring a solution and 5-8 is the Solutionhood nucleus. 1 is the Reason for this problem status that is being given to the feature of the draft text about to be discussed. 2 is the nucleus. It seems to be an Assessment of Richard's choice of example. However there is no text present that this piece of text can be said to be in an assessment relation with. The relation is with the offending text, with a real world item. Had the client said

`This section here Richard on tax codes. It's full of errors.'

then the second sentence could have been an assessment of the first. Although negative evaluation is a key element of the problem then, it won't always be present as a rhetorical relation in a problem satellite. Nevertheless one can expect the nucleus of such a satellite to show lexical evidence of negative evaluation, constituting a problem and that is the case here. The client tells Richard that his choice of example account types `just aren't a good example'. 3-4 is a Reason why this is the case. The Reason in 1 is general; relating to general decisions taken to orient this document at syndicates. In 3-4 Tom specifies which text offends and says that these examples are more apposite to members' agents. The Solution to this Problem comes in 5-8. 5 is a circumstantial relation. It indicates the situational features for which the coming solution holds. 6-8 is a list of alternative account types to Richard's that the client thinks suitable examples for syndicates. The problem here again is not inaccuracy in the technical writer's draft, it is inappropriacy; it doesn't take the perceived audience for the text properly into consideration. This site for negative evaluation is something shared by both the technical writing and public relations data.

The second Solutionhood relation in this matching list is 9-14. 9-11 is the Problem satellite. 9 is the nucleus of the Problem. Something which Richard has written about needs to be removed. 10-11 give the Reason for this. Lexical evidence of negative evaluation of Richard's text comes in both 9 and 10; that the item should be ignored and that it has 'absolutely no impact'. Again however there is no Assessment relation in the text. 12-14 offer a solution. 12-13 is a Joint relation which constitutes the nucleus of the Solution. The solution in fact is to change the programme screen, not just Richard's text. The process of reviewing the draft leads to a review of the system itself. 14 gives a reason for this solution, to support this solution.

I think this is straightforward text, accomplishing quick and unproblematic changes to the draft. There is no opposition, which allows the process to unfold in monolog whereas similar kinds of changes to the pro text in Tape 1 are only achieved through dialogic interaction. Where there is more at stake for the client, company values or key issues in some way, then more fundamental change to the draft text can still be accomplished largely in his monolog but with other relations occurring other than Solutionhood, Reason and Circumstance. We find Enablement, as in Unit 4 or the co-occurrence of Solutionhood and Enablement.

1. See the Chapter on Briefings,and,the Communicative Event Analysis in the Userguide for Tape 4a for background details to this data.

2. See Chapter 7 on decision making, and the

   Communicative Event Analysis for Tape 1 in the Userguide for further background information on this data.

3. See the Communicative Event Analysis for this recording in the Userguide for a background description of this meeting.

CHAPTER 10

RHETORICAL STRUCTURE THEORY BASED GENRE ANALYSIS

10.1 Introduction

This chapter will firstly consider those textual features made manifest through RST analysis that lend support to the hypothesis that there are genres of document design that exist across professional boundaries. In other words, that draft checking in public relations will share genre characteristics with draft checking in technical writing, and similarly with briefings. Generic elements will be identified in terms of the high level rhetorical schemas that regularly occur in monologic units of the data. Once these patterns of clause relations, which I will generally refer to as semantic units, have been identified then their function in the social activity will be accounted for from a generic perspective. Once the evidence for my case has been presented for these two activity types then I will proceed to investigate some intertextual characteristics of document design within professional boundaries, focusing on the technical writing data.

The focus in this chapter will be predominantly on the technical writing texts, as they have not been subjected to the detailed discourse analysis performed on the public relations data. To illustrate generic features that link the two types of text naturally both will be discussed but Rhetorical Structure Analysis will predominantly be applied to the technical writing activity. These are the texts that are largely monologic in nature as the table below illustrates. In order to show genre membership for both types of text, it will be necessary to make an equivalence between what is managed in a monologic manner in technical writing and what is handled more interactively in the public relations texts. Reasons why there should be this basic stylistic difference will be discussed as the analysis unfolds.

Table 10.1 The Occurrence of Monolog in the Document Design Texts

	RST Schemas	Mean Length (in `clauses')	Quantity	Time	Monologic Clauses / min
PR DATA					
Tape 1	10	11.3	113	31	3.6
Tape 4a	11	14.8	163	25	6.5
Tape 4b	9	13.1	118	18	6.5
Tape 4c	8	9.4	75	22	3.4
TECHNICAL WRITING DATA					
Tape 7a	15	37.3	559	45	12.4
Tape 7b	24	21.4	515	45	11.4
Tape 12a	17	22.9	390	45	8.6
Tape 12b	19	20.2	385	45	8.5

10.2 An RST Perspective on the Genre of Draft Review

This section will proceed by examining the key relations that occur in what are largely draft review texts, Tapes 1 and 12. Key relations are those that regularly appear in the top part of the hierarchy of an RST schema. RST analysis will be applied to the monologic units of text that in part constitute the draft review activity.

Texts that possess the most frequently occurring high level relations, where the relations have the greatest text structuring role to play, will then be compared to reveal what similarities there are in the functions of these monologs, partly through their position in the ongoing interactive framework as a meaningful sequentially placed element of dialogue, and partly through an examination of their internal semantic structure, what relations commonly occur with these key relations. It is through the recognition of the functional role that these semantic text structures have within the overall discourse framework that constitutes the social activity in question that genre specific features of these work-based social activities will be looked for and accounted for.

Key Relations in Draft Review

Introduction

Mann & Thompson (1988) and Stewart (1987) suggest that there are ways of categorising the limited number of rhetorical relations identified and used for RST analysis. The most useful of these typologies, for the purposes of this research, is the two way split into semantic and pragmatic relations.[1] By and large, my analysis of document design talk shows that semantic relations dominate where basic patterns of information structure are determining the nature of the talk, and that pragmatic relations are prominent when the intentions of the participants are foregrounded. This chapter will examine possible reasons why sometimes the basic structure of the information that is being encoded has a dominating influence, i.e. occurs at high levels within the monologic schemas, and why at other times the information structure only affects lower level rhetorical relations and the text structuring higher level relations have a stronger pragmatic content to them. Mann and Thompson (ibid) also refer to this distinction in the relations as being between `presentational' and `subject matter' which is an equally apposite classification for the activities that this research is dealing with.

This chapter will now concentrate on those features that link and those features that separate Tapes 1 and 12. One major difference is in the sheer quantity of monolog in Tape 12 compared to that in Tape 1. Even allowing for the differences in meeting length, Table 1 shows that there is almost three times more monologic discourse per minute in Tape 12 than in Tape 1, and the monologic units that do occur in Tape 1 are roughly 50% shorter than those in the equivalent technical writing data.

My major explanation for this is that there is a far greater degree of shared knowledge between the

Justification	9
Concession	4

List	3

The figures are divided into two; for pragmatic or presentational relations above the line and for semantic, subject matter relations beneath. These figures show a large degree of similar rhetorical structuring in the two draft review texts, especially in terms of the pragmatic relations they make use of. A closer examination of these rhetorical relations should highlight what kinds of meanings these two meetings share, what kind of function they both perform.

Because I am looking for generic characteristics I will focus on those relations that the two meetings have in common, namely Solutionhood, Assessment, and Justification. Much more will be said about the role of the Enablement relation, common in Tape 12 but almost absent from Tape 1, when I discuss the intertextual links between the two technical writing meetings in a later section.

10.3 Solutionhood in Draft Review.

To the extent that Tape 12 functions as a draft review meeting its monologs contain high level Solutionhood relations, accompanied by such typically co-occurring rhetorical relations as Assessment and Justification. To the extent that other activities occur within this meeting other kinds of rhetorical structure schemas are evident. The most common of these is the Enablement relation. The presence of Enablement structures does not participants in Tape 1 than in Tape 12. This information is factual. The client company and this public relations officer on Tape 1 have a history going back over a number of documents and other pr work. The public relations officer has spent one whole day a week working for this company and its parent company. In contrast, this is only the technical writer's second formal meeting with his client company, the first being the brief, part of which constitutes Tape 7.

The Key Relations

A count of the relations occurring regularly at mid or high structural levels in the two draft review recordings are as follows.

Tape 12 Key Relations

Solutionhood	18	
Enablement	16	
Assessment	18	(Negative = 9)
Justify	11	
Evidence	7	

Elaborate	12	
List	8	
Restates	8	

Tape 1 Key Relations

Enablement	1	
Solutionhood	5	
Assessment	7	(Negative = 4)

diminish this text as an example of the draft review genre, even though I want to present a case for Enablement being a potential key relation in the briefing genre. Rather one can see what it is that the Enablement text achieves as a contingent element of draft review. Even in the public relations draft review there is one extended example of Enablement occurring with a Solutionhood relation. Genre recognition cannot be simply in terms of which top level relations occur, one needs to look also at the relations encoded within this top level structure and equally important one needs to take account of the company the relations keep; what other top level relations are co-occurring with it. Thus in a briefing, Enablement relations tend to occur along side List and Elaborate structures, whereas in a draft review they occur in the company of Solutionhood relations.

The Solutionhood Relation

Now I want to show the basic range of activity that is encoded in the clause relations of a top level Solutionhood relation. This is the top level relation that structures the draft review activity in Tape 12. In this meeting there are 17 schemas that have a top level Solutionhood relation. In nearly all instances, in discourse terms one can see this text structure as achieving a decision proposal, usually accompanied by negative assessment of the offending draft text.[2]

All these monologs then by definition need to encode a problem and a solution to it. Here are the specific problems and solutions in Tape 12, occurring at the top organisational level.

Table 10.2 Problems and Solutions in the Technical Writing Draft Review

Unit		Problem	Solution
1		Inaccurate Programming	To be able to manipulate values in the documentation.
2		As above	Specifics of the above
5		Terminology	TW should come up with something
6		Poor coverage of business areas	Cl gives specific areas to be covered
7		Too narrow coverage	Specify where coverage can be expanded
8		TW's Command line text	Specify what this text should say
9		Inaccurate text	Correct situation
13	a)	Inadequate account types	Client choice of account types
	b)	An unnecessary feature mentioned in tw text	To remove it
19		The word `deposit'	Cl offers alternative terms
20		Inaccurate text	Cl offers correct alternative
22		Inaccurate draft text	Cl offers accurate information
23		Cl reads offending text	Cl offers correct information
24		Inaccurate text	Cl offers correct information

27	Incomplete text	Cl offers completion
30	TW confusion re financial elements	Cl details the necessary information that tw needs on the financial elements
33	CL realises the text should make some qualifications	Cl specifies these qualifications
35	faulty description	Cl gives correct information

Units 1, 2 and 5 at the opening of the meeting highlight problems that the client company has that they would like the technical writer to offer solutions for in the documentation. After this all but one of the Solutionhood schemas is a solution offered by the client to a problem that he sees in the draft text. The one exception is unit 33 where something occurs to the client that could and should be covered in the documentation. 13 out of 17 schemas then make negative evaluation of the technical writer's text and 17 out of 17 make a decision proposal either in specific terms, what the text should say, what it should cover, or else in non specific terms as in units 1 and 5, where the problem is not with the draft text, but inherent to the client company. Here the Solutionhood nucleus requests the technical writer `to come up with something' rather than offering specific solutions to text problems.

It is a key element of my claim that the draft review in the technical writing meeting belongs to the same genre as the draft review in the public relations meeting that this Solutionhood relation is so prevalent in both as a top level text structuring relation. Additionally, it is a relation that is largely absent from the briefing data belonging to both professional fields, Tapes 4 and 7.

For comparison here are the occurrences of top level Solutionhood relations in Tape 1.

Table 10.3. Problems and Solutions in the Public Relations Draft Review

Unit	Problem	Solution
1	Text Courtauld's Research	Cl wants a different less stuttery start
5	Text needs fundamentals working into it	Cl suggests use of term `eco engineering'
6	Ordering	Cl suggest a different emphasis
8	Message is only a statement of fact	A set of notes from a client colleague that highlights the company's points of excellence.

Noticeably there are far fewer top level Solutionhood relations in Tape 1, even allowing for the difference in duration, but as Chapter 7 shows, the interactive cycle of negative evaluation of text through decision proposal and final acceptance is a common one here. In Tape 12 it is nearly always achieved with monologic text filling the negative evaluation and decision proposal slots, whereas the public relations text has fewer longer turns and achieves similar results in an interactive mode

.

The reason for this difference, I suggest, is due to the length of the parties' working relationships in general, and more specifically to the stage in the document design process at which the draft check occurs. For the technical writer, this is only the second meeting on this project. He is still short of much basic information. This is evident from the fact that the client spends a good deal of time providing briefing like information to him. This is information that will improve and inform the next draft but which is not directly linked to any negative evaluation of the current text under review. This briefing style talk is interspersed between the draft check monologs whose starting point is the evaluation of this first draft. In the public relations text, on the other hand, all the client information given to the public relations officer to improve her next draft is linked to a negative evaluation of the current draft - which is already a third or fourth attempt. The public relations text then is into fine tuning whereas the technical writing text still needs to provide basic building blocks.

Such differences I believe must be containable within one genre definition. A basic key feature then of the genre of draft review in document design is the occurrence of Solutionhood schemas where the problem is part of the draft text and the solution is offered by the client. This is additionally or alternatively realisable by a discourse analytic sequence of Negative Evaluation - Decision proposal and Acceptance. Alternative realisations of obligatory elements and the optional elements that do occur and the way in which they occur can then be used to identify and account for local level differences, the particularities of any one realisation. This loose approach to genre then provides a way of recognising basic common functional features that texts share when they enact a basic activity such as a draft review in a document design process. It also provides a useful framework for identifying and accounting for particular differences from one enactment to another.

Other Key Relations in Draft Review Text

There are a number of other rhetorical relations that can either co-occur with Solutionhood schemas, occur in the same schema as Solutionhood, or even replace the Solutionhood schema in a draft review monolog. These relations are Assessment, Justify, and Enablement. The Enablement relation, as it occurs in Tapes 12, 7 and 1 will be considered in the next section on briefings.

The structure, function and placement of Assessment and Justification relations will now be considered. It is the purpose of this text to show that the production of Solutionhood schemas, or the range of discourse patterning discussed in the discourse analysis chapter on draft review that leads to text change, are the basic activities that constitute the social activity of doing a draft review. These other key relations will be shown to be alternative structurings, dependent on sequential placement and local variables, to the Solutionhood schema, or as having a particular function within a Solutionhood schema.

ASSESSMENT

Negative Assessment

Assessment is a regularly occurring relation within Solutionhood schemas. The regular pattern of occurrence is that negative assessment is part of the satellite, where the problem is located, and positive assessment, should it occur at all, appears as part of the nucleus, that centers on the solution and offers a decision proposal. A focus on the specific content of this relation provides a location which can reveal local differences in the two draft review texts. The range of topics that constitute negative assessment within the problem satellite of top level Solutionhood schemas in Tape 12 are quite limited. They are to do either with inaccuracy of the draft text or poor coverage of areas the client deems important. In Unit 6 the negative assessment is of the technical writer's poor coverage of important business areas. In Unit 7 it is that his coverage is too specific. In unit 5 that he is covering the wrong report types.

In the pubic relations text the focus of the negative assessment is different. The issue here is much less one of accuracy and more concerned with making a good impression. So the opening part of the text needs to be changed so the document doesn't get of to a `stuttery start' (Unit1). Then in Unit 5, where the client makes a DP to use the term `eco engineering' this is negatively assessed, not because it is an inaccurate term to describe what the client company does but because it might lead to negative repercussions because of the parent company's poor pollution control reputation. The negative assessment in Unit 6 again is not with the item's inaccuracy but with its lack of newsworthiness. Finally in Unit 8 the text is criticised for only being a statement of fact, and for not highlighting the company's areas of expertise.

This concern for promoting company strengths is not however limited to public relations. When I discuss the Enablement relation in the technical writing texts it will become clear that this can also be a key area for technical writing preparation. Again, I think the differences are due to staging and are not an indication of genre differences. Solutionhood relations in the technical writing data address the text's inaccuracies because the document design process is at an early stage. Similarly in the public relations meeting, it is not that inaccuracy is unimportant, just that by the third or fourth draft, and with a long working history between pro and client, it is no longer evident.

Positive Assessment

Unit 26 is the only top level positive Assessment relation in Tape 12. It relates to the issue of US and UK tax reports and their value to the system. This unit has a similar set of collocating relations to those found with negative Assessment. The Positive Assessment is supported by a Justification relation (clauses 3-6). This Justification is in terms of the important business potential this issue has for the company. The change to positive assessment, however, marks a change in function for the monologic unit. It is not concerned with the draft text. The client is raising an issue, possibly from the writer's draft text but with no allusion to it if it is, and then highlighting the importance of this issue to the system and thus to the documentation. Clause 1 then is the issue and 2 is the Assessment nucleus, `quite an important issue'. This then is a form of positive assessment. It is not positive assessment of the text, this is a rare event in either draft check recording. It only occurs in Tape 1 when a near final draft is emerging, and then positive evaluation can be used as a close down strategy, in much the same way as is found in presentation talk. Positive assessment can be given of the solution to problem text, examples can be found in Tape 1, or else positive assessment is given to aspects of the company or its products that the client wants highlighted or foregrounded in the documentation.

A top level positive Assessment relation has a function in the technical writing draft review that is linked to Enablement rather than to Solutionhood. The fundamental split in top level relations in Tape 12 is between Solutionhood and Enablement. The few exceptions such as Positive Assessment in Unit 26 perform a function that is related to one or the other of these prime carriers of activity. All the other positive Assessment relations in Tape 12 occur within a top level Enablement environment. This is the main site for foregrounding company values. This feature will be discussed more in the following section on the function of Enablement within the technical writing texts.

Summary

The Negative Assessment relation is regularly linked in both the public relations and technical writing review texts to dissatisfaction with the draft text. It may occur either within an interactive decision making cycle, as is common in Tape 1, or as part of a Solutionhood schema which is common in Tape 12 and also occurs in Tape 1. It may occur as a top level schema itself. This is a rare feature in the data. It only happens once in Tape 1 (in Unit 5, discussed in full in the RST General Analysis chapter) and once in Tape 12, (Unit 17). In both cases there is a decision proposal put by another participant; the pro in Tape 1 and the junior client in Tape 12. The top level Negative Assessment functions on both occasions as a rejection of the other's DP. This kind of activity is common in Tape 1 where decision proposals are roughly shared between client and pro. It is almost totally absent from Tape 12 as it is the senior client who makes nearly all the decision proposals. None are made by the technical writer and few by the junior client. Positive Assessment collocates with Enablement relations and is a site for sharing company values with the technical writer. Its role in draft review is peripheral compared to that of negative Assessment.

Justification

Justification is an important pragmatic relation in draft review meetings in the document design process. There are a number of places where it tends to occur and in a number of different relations apart from being the major satellite relation of an Assessment nucleus.

Here is a breakdown of the occurrences of this relation in both draft review texts.

Table 10.4. Justification in the Draft Review Activity

Tape 1

Unit	Who	Where	Content
1.	cl	Solhood	To justify cl change to pr text
2.	pro	Ass (-)	To justify not changing text
3.	cl	Ass (+)	As support for a pos ev of a text style
4.	cl	Justify	To justify a DP to insert text
6.	cl	Solhood	To justify cl change
7	cl	Restate/Just	A cl text addition - point + justify
8.	cl	Solhood	To justify a neg ev of pr text
9.	pro	Justify	To justify not changing text
10.	pro	Justify	To justify not changing text

Tape 12

Unit	Who	Where	Content
4	cl	Enable	To support cl company position
8	cl	Solhood	To justify cl change to tw text
10	cl	Enable	To justify cl change to tw text
11	cl	Enable	As support for cl position on values

15	cl	List	To justify a future course of action
18	cl	Enable	To justify change to tw text
21	cl	Enable	To support cl company position
24	cl	Neg Assess	Support for cl neg ev of tw text
26	cl	Pos Ass	Support for cl weighting of issues
31	cl	Justify	To justify cl uncertainty about future
35	cl	List	Support for cl change to tw text

It occurs several times as a top level relation in Tape 1. Twice the context is negative evaluation of the draft text by the client. The function of the top level Justification unit is the pro defending her work. Both units 9 and 10 are Justify relations, not internally, but in relation to the client negative evaluation that precedes it, highlighting the sequential significance of these longer turns.

This kind of activity is largely absent from Tape 12. The technical writer there is very much the recipient both of new information to improve his text and of negative evaluation of his first attempt. Only on the rare occasions when he is asked a direct question does the technical writer justify his writing in any way at all. There is one rare instance in between RST Units 3 and 4

Client On the initial introduction section, setting up application codes etcetera, I've just got two questions you know, where are we covering areas like tailorability

TW I was considering having that as a

	separate section perhaps erm as an appendix erm I don't know if that's going to fit in with the way you want to presenting it to clients. From what I've seen of it it's not something that you'd want them to do themselves so it might be worth mentioning it in the introduction.
Client	mm hmm
TW	er and in the appendix giving a sort of indication of what they they can do.

This response gets support from Martin, the client who did the briefing, but its rationale is completely overturned in the following Enablement Unit, Unit 4, by the senior client who is handling the draft review. The technical writer's response to the question shows great tentativity. He puts his proposal in the past tense to reduce its force, `I was considering'. The verb itself suggests that no decision has been made by him on this issue. He then concedes his lack of knowledge as to whether such an approach will suit the client's views on presentation. When he does give his view of the issue `from what I've seen of it' he gives a view that will prove to be in conflict with that held by the text reviewer when he produces the monolog in unit 4. Possibly realising that his earlier briefing was not very good preparation for meeting this client's wishes, it may be the writer's strategy to stay quiet and pick up the information he needs. Alternatively, or additionally, he isn't given much more opportunity to justify his documentation. For approximately the next forty five minutes the technical writer's utterances are reduced to acknowledgement markers and accepts. Any negotiation that takes place is between the two clients. It is not until the issue of using Ventura to solve one of the client's problems, its need to keep the documentation flexible, to allow for new parts of the system to be added and for the numeric specifications to be quickly changed that questions are again fired at the technical writer.

This corresponds with a shift in subject matter from what the client clearly perceives to be A event material (Labov & Fanshel 1977), to what is for him B event, the workings of a desk top publishing program. This latter issue the client recognises as being a technical writer A event, and his expert opinion is sought. As far as the LLoyds' accounting system is concerned, after this initial question on tailorability the client handles matters as his A event, rather than as an A/B event. It is a feature of the talk in the public relations draft review that company issues and text issues are both largely dealt with interactively as AB events. This is almost certainly due to the well developed working relationship that has developed between the participants of that meeting.

This helps to account for the large amount of monologic data in this meeting. It also accounts for the lack of consultant produced top level Justification monologs as found in Tape 1. These are features that change the way a draft review unfolds, but I believe that they do not change the basic requirements of the activity itself, that the consultant text be evaluated and changes be requested, which is the prime generator of the generic characteristics that I am working to reveal.

To return to the use of Justification schemas. In Tape 1 we find two at the top level produced by the consultant. This is clearly an optional genre element in draft review, as the discourse analysis chapter on Tape 1 has detailed. The variables that affect its likelihood of occurrence are at least partly those that I have been describing above.

In Tape 1 Justify is a high level relation in nine out of ten of the monologs produced in that meeting and there are eleven such occurrences in Tape 12. In both Tapes a principal function of the Justification relation is to support a client proposal for change to the draft text. This is the case in all but one of the client produced Justification schemas in Tape 1. The exception, Unit 7, is a Justification that the client is proposing should actually be new brochure text. Not only do decisions to make changes require justification of the proposal but the text itself needs to justify the points it makes.

Unit 1 is a typical Justify relation in Tape 1. It occurs twice; both times in an identical position in the text hierarchy, as justification of each of the two list related solutions. We see the client producing text in a matching relation, signalling the likelihood that the talk is typical and regular in the particular activity. The Justify relation itself is not being promoted as a genre element, it is closer to what Lemke calls a `rhetorical structure' (passim) which within text genres fulfil a specific functional role. Here that function is to support the client's text proposals. This functional element, which is regularly occurring in draft review, can then be seen as a generic feature. The use of a Justification schema is one alternative coding for this functional slot of decision proposal support. The slot itself, however, is nearly always filled in the professional document design transcriptions available to me and can therefore be seen as an obligatory element. This does not mean that it must always occur but that its absence would be noticeable.

Unit 8 has been described in some detail in the RST general analysis chapter. Here I only want to comment on the function of the Justify satellite. As evidence that it is not in itself a functional element, but rather a rhetorical structure that can take on a different function according to its particular context. This unit has a Justification relation in the problem section of a Solutionhood schema. In this location it cannot function as a decision proposal support, as it does in Unit 1, because it is linked to that part of the text which is concerned with the problem. In this monolog the nucleus of the problem is 3 - 'we had our reservations'. 4-10 is a Justification of this position. So in discourse analysis terms the Justification satellite functions as support for the negative evaluation.

Within this particular span we find examples of all the key pragmatic relations that are commonly occurring in draft review monologic interaction; Concession, Evidence, and Assessment. Little attention has been paid in this chapter to the function of Evidence relations or Concession relations because they are largely low level relations, as in this unit. They occur within the problem satellite of a Solutionhood relation and then within the Justify span within the problem satellite. This low level placement makes such relations less important in terms of large scale text structuring, in terms of determining the discourse function that these monologs are assigned. Nevertheless they are commonly occurring relational collocates with Solutionhood, Justification and Assessment.

In a draft review context where the work of a professional is receiving negative evaluation from his or her client there is usually some pragmatic effort made to save the face of the text writer. In this text each of the three Concession relations admit the accuracy or truthfulness of the pro's text before going on to make a negative judgement about it. Other instances may try to reduce the importance of the error, `this isn't important but', or the client may take some blame for the fault, `this is an area that has been causing us some trouble but'. This is not a generic feature perhaps in terms of optional and obligatory functional elements but in terms of the way such a functional element as negative evaluation of a draft text item is managed, if this genre element were to be placed under a microscope for more detailed micro analysis of its internal structure then the regular occurrence of a face saving function would be evident, and quite regularly achieved through the use of a concession relation, whether in dialogue or monolog.

Evidence is another common relation occurring within Justification or Assessment spans. In this example (Unit 8) the problem in 3 is that the client team have `their reservations' with the public relations text. The Justification for this negative evaluation is in 4-5.

we were putting across a message which was fine but it was really just a statement of fact.

Then Evidence is given that the text does in fact have these flaws. What the evidence relation here supplies is the internal structure of the negative evaluation support which is the functional element being realised by the whole Justification span. This analysis will try to recognise commonly occurring rhetorical structures; relations and their relational collocates that typically occur in document design locations, but it will principally be concerned with units at the level of Solutionhood and Justification in Tape 1 Unit 8 which clearly carry the organisational structure of the text at a genre element level.

In Tape 12, due to its largely monologic character, only the client produces Justification schemas. Their function as original text support is not therefore realised in this meeting. All but one of the client produced Justification relations have one of only two functions. Units 8, 10, 18, 24 and 35 all function to support changes that the client wants made to the text. This can be seen as the generic element of draft review that is regularly constructed by a Justification relation. The other purpose, in units 4, 11, 21, 26 and 31 is to support the client's view of the company, its values and its key features. This use of Justification regularly collocates with Enablement. This is the one key relation that separates Tape 12 from Tape 1. The function of this relation in Tape 12 and reasons why it occurs in that draft review but not in the public relations version are the subject matter of the next section of this chapter.

10.4 The Enablement Relation in the Draft Review Meetings

The Enablement relation is a key relation in document design. It plays an important role in both technical writing texts, although the particular realisations are quite different. It is a regular top level relation in Tape 12 and more commonly a lower level relation in Tape 7. There is only one example of it in Tape 1 and none at all in Tape 4. For the present I shall consider its role within the two draft review meetings. Later in this chapter I shall consider it more broadly as an intertextual feature of the technical writing texts and explore its potential as a key site in differentiating technical writing talk from public relations.

Enablement is a pragmatic relation and when it occurs at a high level in the text structure we can expect it to be an important site for understanding how key aspects of the document design activity are constructed. As an indication of the area of activity that is encoded by a top or high level Enablement relation in a draft review meeting here are the Enablement nuclei from Tape 12. They are many in number but all share something in common.

Table 10.5. Enablement Nuclei From the Technical Writing Draft Review Text

Unit 2

I'm wondering whether there's an alternative mechanism that you might be able to explore ... and sort of say ...

Unit 4

One of the points I made before is I am keen for the users to have some appreciation of the power of the software they are working with ....

Unit 6

I just want this to give the impression or I want this section to cover the fact that you know the business areas addressed by this product are ....

Unit 10

There's an option to copy - there's only one at the moment but it should be standard, so we may as well build that in. Right so I think we probably want to have it say . . .

Unit 11

And again I suppose that what we would like to try and do is to try and qualify some of that power that we've got there without going into too much detail

Unit 12

Again in this section on application codes I'd like to make the point that the size of codes is variable

Unit 14

This sort of tends to imply that for buying equities there is only one associated cost, the book value, but in terms of trade input there is a lot more

Unit 18

And certainly that is something that I would like to sell on ... the soft ware can deliver that and again it will cost them some money but I don't want to put them off by saying it's going to be very costly and very time consuming

Unit 21

And again part of the power of the application, I'd like to see it expressed somewhere is the ability to bolt on different trade input processes very easily.

Unit 28

In certain areas here like creating an account ... I think we just want to make the point that they are external user defined tables that are perhaps covered in the codes section

Unit 29

One of the important points to , I don't think it's made about the gains and loss report is that .. it is based on a first in first out sequence

Unit 32

Valuation reports are almost fairly flexible, I just want to make this point in the valuation section

Unit 34

On this section on Workwith account holdings
I just want us again to make the point that ...

what you are actually doing is putting a transaction into the transaction database

Unit 35

I think that's probably the point we want to express in there

and

I just want to make the link between areas where we are asking for something like a nominal value to say there's a further explanation in the create instrument tool or wherever ...

Unit 36

The book value for the holding, I think we ought to explain it a bit more

and

I think we've got to convey some of that, all of that to the user

All these statements perform a similar function in Tape 12. They are all made by the chief client in the meeting and all express, in general or specific terms, what he would like to see in the documentation. The Enablement relation then links this nuclear desire of the client with more specific information which will enable the technical writer to realise the client's wishes.

There are two basic types of Enablement relation in the meeting; those that are linked to a Solutionhood relation, where there is a specific problem with the text and those that are not.

The table below shows the environment in which mid or high level Enablement structures occur in Tape 12.

Table 10.6. Enablement Collocations in Tape 12

Unit	Enable (High)	Sol	Enable (Mid)	Others	DP
2		Y	Y	JUSTIFY	Y
4			Y	JUSTIFY	Y
6		Y	Y	NEG ASSESS	Y
7		Y	Y	NEG ASSESS	Y
10	Y			JUSTIFY	Y
11	Y			JUSTIFY/ POS ASS	Y
12	Y			POS ASS	Y
14	Y	Y			Y
18	Y	Y		JUSTIFY/ NEG ASS	Y
21	Y	Y		JUSTIFY	Y
24			Y	NEG ASS	N
28	Y			-	Y
29	Y			RESTATE	Y
32	Y			-	Y
34	Y			-	Y
35			Y	POS ASS	Y
36	Y				Y

Like the Solutionhood relation, Enablement regularly encodes a decision proposal, at least it does in Tape 12 when it occurs at a high level in the text structure. Whereas Solutionhood encodes a decision proposal that is usually bound to some draft failing, the Enablement relation is less text specific. The decision proposal itself may be a point of detail or it may be the location where the client can pass on to the technical writer his view of what are key company issues that need to be carried by the documentation. The function of the Solutionhood relation in draft review is to provide

Solutions to text based problems. Enablement clearly has a related function, to show the writer how to achieve the aims the client has for a text. The solutionhood relation is essential for performing the draft review activity. Enablement can be seen as optional as its occurrence depends on the perceived need to tell the writer how to do his or her job. Very little need is seen in Tape 1 and there is a corresponding absence of Enablement relations. In Tape 12, where the technical writer is unfamiliar with the company and its culture, its values and its positive features there is a need to enable the text that the client wants. This can be, but as the table above shows, need not be linked to a problem with the text as it stands. The client can enable low level solutions in the text and he can enable the encoding of company values in the text. The Enablement schemas in this meeting where the passing on of company values is located are in Units 2, 4, 12, 18, 21 and 32.

Collocating Relations with Enablement

All of these Units, except 32, also carry other important pragmatic relations. In 12 there is Positive Assessment and Evidence and in all the others there is a Justification span. Units 2 and 4 are early client monologs in this meeting, occurring before review of the draft document has got properly underway. Unit 2 can be seen as Enabling the non specific solution that is the end point of unit 1. This is an example of Solutionhood being the higher level relation and incorporating an Enablement relation. The non specific solution in clause 14 of unit 1 is enabled by means of the information in Unit 2.

The solution then is

> to develop some sort of document whereby we might be able to manipulate and change those values erm at will.
> (Tape 12, Unit 2, 14)

The Enablement satellite opens with a Justification span, a commonly co-occurring relation with Enablement. The information between 4 and 27 should increase the technical writer's willingness to accept that this is a helpful solution. It details features of the system and its need to incorporate change that justify the client's DP in the Solutionhood schema in unit 1a. The nucleus of the Enablement satellite is itself an Enablement relation. 29-31 is a Restate of the Solution in 14-15 of unit 1, and 32-35 offers a kind of mechanism that the technical writer might use to incorporate this flexibility. 36-44 encode another typical co-occurring relation with Enablement and that is Assessment. It is not negative assessment, which is to be found regularly in problem satellites within Solutionhood schemas, but comes as assessment of the task that is being set the writer. Here the client assesses what he is asking as 'quite difficult'.

Neither Unit 1 nor 2 is concerned with draft review. The client is encoding for the technical writer an unspecified idea of what the approach to the documentation should be, rather than just correcting the text. This client, then, can be seen as adding to the briefing that the technical writer has already received. The meeting opens with this general orientation on how to go about the task, which clearly would have benefitted the technical writer in the initial briefing. When we look at the rhetorical relations in that meeting (Tape 7), we will see how little of this emphasising company values occurs there. Its absence is locatable in the quite different kind of Enablement relations that do occur in that meeting. Enablement is a relation that can occur, but would appear to be non obligatory, in both draft check and briefing. Evidence that this recording, Tape 12, is draft review plus extra briefing material, however, is located in the Enablement relations that are not text specific, such as unit 2 Solutionhood is a generic relation in draft review. Enablement is a relation to be associated with briefing like activity; it is not solution centered so much as information centered, and this may be seen as a distinguishing feature of the two basic operations being analysed here.

Unit 4 picks up on another company value that the client wants to see in the documentation. Again it is captured in two ennested Enablement relations. The point made in clause 1 and again in clause 8-12, the two enablement nuclei is that the client

> is keen for the users to read something like that (1)

and

> I'm keen for the users to have some appreciation of the power of the software they are working with (9)

The documentation then is not just, in this client's eyes, to explain the workings of the system, it is also available to construct a positive view of the software in the user's mind. This involves not just having clear instructions but placement of information so that users will definitely read it. The manual is to have rhetorical purpose and not just an informational function. The manual should not only affect the user's ability to operate the system but is being used by the software producers to increase the users' regard for their software and for the client company itself.

Unit 4 is another Enablement relation that contains Justification satellites; one for each Enablement nucleus. In 1-7 1 is the nucleus, it states the client wish and 2-7, the Enablement satellite, state how it can be achieved. 6-7 in this satellite justifies this Enablement. 13-16 justifies the main Enablement nucleus of this unit, 8-12. This satellite is the client's Justification for making such information available to the user in such an upfront way.

Enablement plus Justification

So alongside draft review and correction there is an ongoing pattern in Tape 12 of the client wishing to see something in the documentation, which may be specific and/or may encode a rhetorical purpose for the documentation. These corporate values occur in Enablement nuclei. Their satellites specify how this material might get into the documentation. A regularly collocating relation in this environment is Justification. It functions to explain and make the course of action being suggested acceptable as a goal for the technical writer in his writing. This then is a supporting function for the non text oriented decision proposals.

10.5 Briefing Elements in Tape 12

Some clear evidence that this meeting takes on a briefing function as well as being a draft review can be seen in and around the Enablement relation in Unit M. The need for this unit develops in this way.

T ok is there a section I can't remember probably is there a section on organisations?

M no because at the time we started to draft this that wasn't part of the system

T right

M erm so we probably need a whole new section on organisations erm which may impact on depending how much work there is, we need to go into that

R right yes

T Have you covered any of organisations with Tim previously?

M no no we haven't

T right. That's an area that you need to cover with Martin

R mmm

M Something we need to look at to see how much work is probably there

(Tape 12, pre Unit 11)

This is clearly interactive and non monologic. This is the first mention of Organisations in the meeting and the client opens the topic with a pre-sequence to establish whether this topic has been covered or not in Martin's earlier briefing. Martin excuses its lack of coverage and promises that it will be covered. There is then a further check question form the client to be quite clear whether the issue has been covered with the technical writer or not. The result of this question is a directive DP from the client, aimed at Martin that this will have to be done. Clearly then, because of fast moving developments in the system, new areas need to be covered. The nature of this company's work means that briefing and draft review are not easily separable. That as the documentation develops there will be new gaps in it due to programming developments in the system. The client could have left matters here, for Martin as directed, to cover this issue in a later briefing. But from here on the client does the brief himself. It opens straight after the above text.

T Basically again the concept of organisations is that anything that is well . . . [3] quite a difficult thing to put put a boundary around isn't it

M anything that a syndicate deals with

T well it's not er, in terms of the concept it's an organisation . . [2] there have got to be people and companies you know in that sense individuals and, I'm trying to avoid using the word organisation

(Tape 12 pre Unit 11)

The client realises this is more difficult than he thought. From this false start he develops a 57 clause monolog to brief the technical writer on organisations that has a top level relation of Enablement. As this is briefing talk there is no problem with the text to be dealt with. In the core briefing data, Tapes 4 and 7, there are very few Solutionhood relations. When we look at those that do occur in Tape 4b it can be argued that the presence of top level Solutionhood relations counts as evidence that what is going on is not a briefing at those times but decision making necessary for, as a precondition to briefing activity occurring.. Similarly here, long monologs with an Enablement relation, not connected to draft text problems, indicate that something that is not essential to a draft review is occurring. Its regular occurrence however, as with the decision making cycles in Tape 4b indicate that something locally necessary to the whole document design process is occurring, even if it is not an essential element of the basic genre activity that the meeting constitutes. In Tape 4b it was client agreement on information that could function as briefing information that was missing. In Tape 12 it is the technical writer's lack of familiarity with the company, its products and its values that needs to be dealt with.

This particular monolog, unit 11, takes on what we will see is a typical briefing rhetorical structure of high level List relations with more List relations and Elaboration satellites within them. This I will argue, when I discuss the briefing monologs in Tape 7, is a common rhetorical pattern found in briefings when the information itself is structuring the course of the talk. Naturally one talks about a number of connected but separate items, hence the List relation, and naturally one expands on each of the items, which accounts for the Elaboration. List plus Elaboration is a frequently occurring high or even top level relation set both in the technical writing brief and in Tape 4a, which is the most 'brief like' section of the public relations briefing in Tape 4. Likewise in this monolog there are three main topics that the client develops. The nucleus of the first List element is 1.

1. Now there tends to be common at least a common core of information that you generally want to record about these types of entity
(Tape 12, Unit 11, 1)

This issue then gets elaborated before the second strand of the high level List relation is introduced. Part of the nucleus for this List element is 6-7.

6. right and it's a sort of product within all of our products
7. and therefore sits in on all of our products
(Tape 12, Unit 11, 6-7)

This area is elaborated in some depth before the third and final part of the List structure is produced. The nucleus for this is 27.

27. but organisations obviously again is a bigger ball of wax
(Tape 12, Unit 11, 11)

This, admittedly is slightly different to the other two List element nuclei. rather than introducing an area of organizations to be developed as a briefing unit for the technical writer the client is making claims about the importance of this issue. This means that what follows the nucleus, 28-52 may be coded as Justification rather than Elaboration; information is elaborated on, claims are justified. Within the List structure the client has moved from simply informing about organisations to stressing the importance of this feature in the system and justifying his view, which makes it an important feature to be recorded in the documentation.

Retrospective Coding Within Monolog

What turns this typical briefing structure into a top level Enablement relation is the client's final part of the monolog.

53. again . . . [2] in terms of documenting that within the user manual
54. I don't know whether it organisations will go in as a subsection

M I would put it in as a section in its own way actually

T
55. and again you know I suppose that what we would like to do is to try and qualify some of that power that we've got there,
56. without going into too much detail

R mmm

T
57. you know but in this instance we would normally say a syndicate will have one underwriter

(Tape 12, Unit 11, 53-57)

There is a two second pause in 53 and it is after this that the Enablement nucleus is produced. All the information that has preceded this now takes on the function as being not necessarily information to be put straight in other documentation but information that will enable the technical writer to present the information, to weight the information according to the client's wishes as we see here particularly in 55-56.

What we see happening in this monolog then is that the function of talk produced in monolog is not necessarily available, ie equipped with a discourse function until the monolog is complete. What occurs at the end of this monolog is a retrospective coding of the fifty four clauses that have preceded it, not as briefing units standing independently but as information that will enable the writer to produce text in accordance with the client's wishes. In discourse terms it means that the monolog from clause 1 to clause54 is no longer to be coded as *informs plus elaborations* but as support for the decision proposal in 53-57. *Top level Enablement* relations always encode a decision proposal, as do draft review units structured as Solutionhood relations. Briefing units that do not have a top level Enablement relation however, do not necessarily encode a decision proposal at all.

10.6 The Enablement Relation in a Public Relations Draft Review Text

The Enablement relation only occurs once in Tape 1. An examination of that structure and of sites in that data where company values are located, for they are located there, and in similar terms to those found in the technical writing data, should help in the recognition of generic similarities and differences between these two examples of document design draft review meetings. It occurs in Unit 8 which has been covered in detail in Chapter 9. Here I want to consider why only this unit should have an Enablement relation at all in this draft review. I believe its occurrence is linked to the issue of the writer's familiarity with the subject. It seems that electrical engineering may well be an area of Focus

Technology's capabilities that the pro is less knowledgeable about than usual. The information she receives back from her draft is not Ian's, her regular company contact but from an electrical engineering specialist. My account for why there are two Enablement relations in the Solutionhood nucleus of this relation is that the electrical engineering specialist, John Nichols found the draft text so wanting that in order to feel sure that the pro would produce the kind of text he wanted, he had to produce detailed notes on the company's electrical engineering expertise.

In this top level Solutionhood relation, as in many others in Tape 1 we do find client company values being foregrounded. What is different here is that it is seen as insufficient simply to make a Solution Decision Proposal to focus on company strengths without providing detail for the pro on what those strengths are. It is this provision of detail that Ian refers to even as a brief.

> So he's written out a bit of text here, along the lines of a bit of a brief I think.
> (Tape 1, Unit 8, 22)

This then is the only monologic unit in this meeting that has a brief like quality and it is the only monolog with an Enablement relation in it. The Enablement relation functions to give the pro the basic information from which she can construct text that will solve the problem that is described in the problemhood satellite. The problem is that the text only encodes factual information about Focus technology. It is not rhetorically organised to foreground their positive features; those items that separate Focus Technology from their competitors. This, one would expect to be a basic aspect of a public relations text. What is interesting is that the same kind of concern, to rhetorically foreground the company's business strengths, is equally apparent in the technical writing draft review meeting.

Both briefings and draft reviews are available occasions for encoding company values in both public relations and technical writing, although admittedly, I have no data from the briefing that preceded Tape 1. The determining feature for how this information is structured would seem to depend on the real or perceived view of the writer's familiarity with the subject, and not on anything inherent to public relations or technical writing work. Company values in Tape 12 are all structured in Enablement relations. The technical writer has little knowledge of what his client company does. What he knows has come from the briefing in Tape 7 and the evidence there suggests that little attention was paid to company values in that meeting. In Tape 1 company values are more commonly encoded in Solutionhood units or within ongoing discursive interaction. The one occasion when an Enablement relation is used, and the client refers to what is happening as `a bit of a brief' is when specialised information not familiar to the pro is given to her to enable her to write the text as the client wishes. This need to inform on unfamiliar topics will lead to briefing activity even within what is predominantly a draft review meeting.

When the pro in Tape 1 is on familiar ground, however, dealing with topics that Ian provides the draft review for then the Solutionhood monologs and the discourse analytic production of decision proposals for the text, arising out of negative evaluation of the draft text are a suitable site for expressing company values. So in Unit 1, which is a top level Solutionhood relation we find the client not dealing with matters of accuracy, which are often what is dealt with in Solutionhood relations in the technical writing text, but with the ordering of information to foreground Focus Technology strengths right from the start of the document.

> .. . it got off to a very stuttery start and I was trying to tighten it up a bit
> I thought we might be able to move that into this part here, sort of establishing our credentials
> (Tape 1, Unit 1, 2-4)

Again in Unit 6, another top level Solutionhood relation, we find the client rejecting the term `anti pollution equipment' because it is `a bit sort of Daily Mirror'. In other words that it is not so much inaccurate information but that it sends the wrong rhetorical signals to the readership. It reduces Focus Technology's claim to be regarded as doing innovative scientific and technical work, by using a non scientific term and replacing it with one from popular journalism. Another complaint from Ian in this unit is that the text has `started to lose the personal touch'. Again, this is not a matter of accuracy, of factual detail, but of the image that Focus Technology wants to present itself with as a personalised customer sensitive company. These corporate values are not only to be found in the few Solutionhood monologs in this meeting, they recur throughout the basic interactive decision proposal patterns that constitute draft review when not performed monologically as in Tape 12. Both these latter two references to company values in Tape 12 occur in negative Assessment relations within the problem span of Solutionhood relations. The company value itself is not being explicated as we find in Tape 12. In Tape 1 the company value appears to be common knowledge. The client merely refers to it as a fault with the text. he does not need to enable a better version by detailing what the company value is. It is this kind of difference that separates enablement from solutionhood relations and core draft review activity from more briefing like behaviour

It is the regular occurrence of Solutionhood relations with decision proposals that involve changing the draft text that is the main evidence that Tape 12 and Tape 1 belong to the same genre. The encoding of company values in both these meetings I view as intertextual evidence that the public relations documentation design activity and the technical relations equivalent share a common unit of content. The fact that these values are structured differently, largely from one meeting to the other, is evidence not that the professional fields of technical writing and public relations are different so much as that the Rhetorical Structure Analysis used to capture the social activity in these meetings is in fact sensitive to different local variables, such as degree of shared knowledge, that effect the way an activity will be constituted. This is evidence that rhetorical structure theory can capture functional variation in language use, even at such a delicate level.

10.7 An RST Perspective on the Genre of Briefing

The Briefing Meetings. Tape 7 and Tape 4

Both these meetings break into three rough parts. In Tape 7 this is a structure imposed on the meeting by the client. Having provided a background to the company in Unit 1 he frames the second section as introducing the system and the third as `ploughing through the system'. The breakdown in Tape 4 is mine. Tape 4a is the brief on Derek's document and Tape 4b and 4c concern Bob's. Tape 4c is that part of the meeting that takes place once Frank, the pro has put a ten minute time limit on dealing with outstanding issues. The breakdown of high level rhetorical structures for each part of each recording is given below, semantic relations above the dotted line and pragmatic below.

Key Relations in Briefings

Table 10.7. Key Relations in Briefing Meetings

Tape 7 Part 1

No of Schemas	11
List	8
Restate	4
Elaboration	7

Assess	2
Justify	2
Solutionhood	2
Enablement	1
Low Enable	-

Tape 7 Part 2

No of Schemas	12
List	9
Restate	1
Elaboration	5

Assess	1
Justify	2
Solutionhood	-
Enablement	3
Low Enable	5

Tape 7 Part 3

No of Schemas	14
List	6
Restate	1
Elaboration	10

Assess	2
Justify	2
Solutionhood	2
Enablement	1*

Tape 4

Tape 4a

No of Schemas	11
List	7
Contrast	3
Restate	2

Motivation	1
Solutionhood	1
Assessment	2
Justification	3

Tape 4b

No of Schemas	11
List	4

Contrast	3
Elaborate	3
Reason	3

Motivation	1
Solutionhood	1
Assessment	1
Concession	3
Justification	6

Tape 4c

List	2
Disjunct	1
Sequence	1

Solutionhood	2
Assess	2

An Overview of the Key Relations

The clearest indication from these figures is the shift in top level text structuring relations from being largely pragmatic in the draft review data to predominantly semantic here in the briefing data. Or, alternatively there is a marked shift away from persuasive, presentational relations to those that reflect the information structure. Table 10.7 indicates the basic generic semantic structuring of briefing meetings in document design settings. By and large the information structure dictates the form of the message being produced. This view accounts for the predominance of List plus Elaborate structures. Where the two tapes differ, we find differences in information structure accounting for different non pragmatic relations. We also find local level differences in the interpersonal relations of the participants involved that do affect the occurrence of the part pragmatic relation of Purpose.

Local Features Affecting Information Structure in the Briefings

There are high level Contrast relations in Tape 4 entirely due to the fact that there are other documents available to compare with the document under discussion. The kind of link that should exist between Bob's and Derek's documents is a key area of dispute in Tape 4b, and in Tape 4a the contrast is used as an information structuring device. In Tape 7 such an option is simply unavailable to the client. What there is in Tape 7 that does not occur in Tape 4 is a number of low level Enablement relations. These will be discussed in more detail in the last part of this chapter to follow, but briefly, these are Enablement structures that are not effecting the overall structure of the text in the way that top level Enablement relations do in Tape 12. They are occurring within the top level List and Elaborate schemas. At a low level however, they do function pragmatically to show the technical writer how the accounting system works. He is not just being informed, he is being enabled. The elements of the situation are different in Tape 4. There is no computer system to demonstrate; only a need to provide likely text, pictures, and a sense of client approach which will enable the designer to produce suitable drafts for a later meeting.

As I have described in detail in Chapter 9, there is a local, non generic reason for the regular occurrence of Justification schemas in Tape 4a. It is a result of the participant structure of the meeting. It is due to the fact that there are two clients present who share the task of briefing the designer. On of these, the pro is experienced in this kind of work and the other, Derek is not. Consequently he uses the Justification relation interpersonally, to assure Juliana that by Frank's consent, the information he is providing her with does have the status of a briefing unit, it is the most current information agreed by the client team.

These briefings then share genre characteristics due to their focus on information structure. They both differ from the draft review documents in their lack of pragmatic relations, particularly Solutionhood and Enablement. Solutionhood is the basic relation for encoding text centered decision proposals and is at the heart of a draft review. We have seen also that top level Enablement structures are a potential feature of briefings. They occur in both Tapes 1 and 12. In Tape 12, where they are common, they perform briefing like activity, in that they are elaborated decision proposals from the client on how he would like the text to be, which need not be related to any specific negative evaluation of the draft text. A top level Enablement relation does however encode a decision proposal concerning the desired content of the final text. It is this discourse feature that is lacking from the main technical writing briefing meeting and from Tape 4a at least of the public relations briefing, which will be the public relations focus for this section.

A decision proposal is clearly an interpersonal, as much as an ideational, use of language. Ideationally there is an issue that needs to be put into words.

Interpersonally there is an act that one participant wants doing, either by the writer or as a collaborative effort. The work in a decision proposal is not so much the structuring of the information within it but the presentation of it so as to have it accepted as a decision. It is this feature which is generally lacking from all Tape 7 and parts a and c of Tape 4. The presence of decision proposals in Tape 4b has been extensively dealt with in Chapter 7, and this ground will not be retrodden here.

10.8 The Organisation of Briefing Information in Tapes 4a and 7

In discourse analytic terms the public relations briefing has proved least amenable of the public relations data to discourse analysis. This is partly because even in the public relations data, especially in Tape 4a where a non disputative approach is adopted, the briefing is carried by longer turns at talk which do not respond well to a sequential turn by turn based system of analysis. An RST approach is better suited to the analysis of monolog. If there is less clear sequential structure, then a rhetorical approach can focus on semantic features of the talk. When this is coupled with a larger scale discourse analytic framework in which monologs constitute functional elements of interactive social activities then one should have an analytical tool of appropriate power to deal adequately, from a genre analytic point of view, with the data in these briefing meetings.

Limitations of a Sequential Method of Analysis

Tape 4 has been analysable using discourse analysis because there are regularly occurring turns from each participant and regularly occurring types of activity that have a common discourse structure. In both Tape 4 and Tape 7 the topic type most likely to be initiated by the person being briefed is a 'seek information' topic. Chapter 6 has detailed Juliana's use of such activity. In Tape 7, the technical writer opens the meeting as questioner. These questions can be seen as enabling his own briefing, ensuring he gets the background information he wants. Juliana tends to receive relatively simple short responses, there is regular turn taking which allows a sequential analysis of the turns at talk. In the technical writing data, however, the responses are very lengthy. In discourse terms they can be reduced to `inform plus' units; plus elaboration, reason, evaluation, as has been detailed in Chapter 6. Nevertheless, the lack of developed two way interaction means that it is difficult to interpret one utterance in the light of the other's previous or his follow up. Rhetorical Structure Theory provides one way of analysing the regularity of internal structure that these lengthy turns have, which on completion, are assigned a discourse function. This is not just an analyst technique for dealing with difficult data, but one which I think is available to participants for making sense of monologic talk. Sections of this chapter that describe the phenomenon of retrospective coding give some support to this view.

The discourse functions that occur in Tape 7 are largely the same as those found in Tape 4a and 4c; the client provides suitable briefing information, in the discourse format of inform plus units. One aim of this section is to show that RST plus topic type analysis are more suitable approaches to the analysis of a briefing when it is performed in a largely monologic manner.

Combining RST with Topic Type Analysis

Using a Florence Davies topic type approach to a briefing, the kind of semantic slots that one would expect a briefing unit to fill would centre on the following.

What is the product?
What are its parts?
Who is it for?
What does it do?
How does it work?

This section will combine RST analysis with topic type analysis to reveal generic features in these briefing texts. The rhetorical structure of a briefing unit is found in top level List plus Elaborate relations. Commonly co-occurring relations in this environment include Background, Restate, Sequence and Contrast. This is the case in all the following, listed monologic units in all three parts of Tape 7. Noticeably these too are all semantic, non pragmatic or presentational relations. They are concerned with the information structure and do not foreground interpersonal features of the talk.

Table 10.8. Information Structured Units in Tape 7

In section 1 (background info); 1, 1A, 3, 4, 5, 6*,

7, 8, 10*
In section 2 (intro to the system); 11**, 12**. 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20**, 21, 22
In section 3 (ploughing through the system); 23, 24, 26*, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33**, 34, 35, 36

* = A top level Contrast relation or something other than List which is still a semantic relation.
** = This unit has some pragmatic relation at a mid or high level but still structures the majority of the talk under a List or Elaboration relation.

There is clearly a common pattern to the production of monologic talk in each section of this briefing. I shall concentrate here on sections 2 and 3 as these relate more directly to the kind of brief found in Tape 4A. The first section occurs as a direct result of this being an entirely new working relationship. This means the technical writer arrives equipped with a set of background questions to orient himself to the company. This information is nearly all requested by the technical writer and provided as a response by the client. Quite noticeably it has very similar rhetorical structure to the second and third sections of the recording. It is the client who divides his talk up into these three sections. These are participant categories and provide a useful way of dividing this data up.

To take the third section, here the client refers to what they are doing as 'ploughing through the system. Sat in front of a computer screen with a company client's 'live' data before them the client shows the technical writer around the different menus of the system and one by one goes through each menu feature. As long as the brief is dealing with a menu feature the structure is the common one of List, Elaboration, possible Restate and possible Assessment. List and Elaborate can both occur as top level relations. It seems to be entirely dependent on the structure of the information content. Most commonly in this section, because the talk is structured around individual menu items, is a top level Elaboration relation. Thus there is one issue, the menu item, the details of which need to be specified. This specification then tends to come in a number of sections, which results in a second level List relation. This pattern is reversed in the first section of the brief. Here, the broad background questions asked by the technical writer receive lengthy answers that are organised in sections. This gives a top level List relation within which each item of the list is expanded, detailed and specified, which occurs within an Elaboration relation.

The rhetorical structure categories can be seen to have a very direct functional orientation. They reflect the uses to which language is put. If there is a foregrounded pragmatic purpose, as is the case in Tape 12, then the top level rhetorical relations of the text should reflect this fact. If not and the text is only structured according to the information units within it then one will see a predominance of more semantic or logical relations at high levels in the text structure.

10.9 Relations that Collocate with or Replace the List - Elaborate Structure

Contrast

Other commonly occurring relations in this meeting are Contrast, Sequence, Background, Restate and Assessment. All but Assessment fall into the non pragmatic side of Mann and Thompson's basic two part typology of their rhetorical relations. The use of the Contrast relation can be seen as an alternative to List. Obviously it is not a free choice; it depends on the nature of the relations between the items that are under discussion. If there is simply A and B there will be a List relation. If in addition there is A, and B, which differs from A in some ways, then there will be a Contrast relation.

Sequence

Sequence is a natural relation for describing an order of events or actions. Naturally therefore the siting of this relation is limited to talk about the system. It occurs in sections 2 and 3 of the brief but not in the opening background brief section. Unit 17 is one example unit where the sequence relation covers quite a large span of text. There is the typical Elaboration relation above it and it is the satellite of this relation that is structured as a three part sequence of ordered actions to be carried out in order to enter the application.

3a-11 tells you the first action to be performed
12-13 tells you what action you can do now you are

at this stage
14-17 describes the final preparation for accessing the part of the system the client wants to brief the technical writer on.

There are no Sequence relations in Tape 4. This is due I think to local considerations rather than any key difference between public relations and technical writing. The Sequence relation answers the briefing question 'How does it work'. A question that relates well to a computer system but not to a designer brief on an envisaged new document. It is I think a difference that is subject matter determined, rather than a professional difference.

Background

The Background relation is common across the briefings. It normally, but not always occurs before the List - Elaboration core structure and provides useful orienting information that is designed to help the recipient make sense of the core briefing data. It is much more common in Tape 7 than Tape 4 and I think this can be explained in terms of the lack of working history between client company and consultant in Tape 7.

Restate

Restate is also a common top level relation in both the briefing recordings. It seems to be a feature of this talk that once a briefing unit has been produced, that one available choice to its producer is to restate it, to give a concise summary of the point being made. This is arguably a feature of information transfer in the spoken mode. Because text structure is worked at and produced dynamically; there are no options to erase text and to find better expression. Once the expression has been found the option to run through it again smoothly, to ensure, I presume, that the key messages are clear, is one that is regularly taken in all the professional spoken data under analysis in this research.

Assessment

A final relation that regularly occurs within standard briefing units organised around List and Elaborate structures is that of Assessment. It is the only commonly occurring, mid to high level pragmatic relation to do so, apart from Justify and Enablement. The Justify relation only occurs in Tape 4a and has been accounted for in Chapter 9. Enablement relations in briefings tend to be low level with limited text structuring power. They will be discussed in relation to those in Tape 12 in the final section of this chapter.

Assessment in a briefing is different to what we find in the draft checking data. In Solutionhood relations there is generally negative assessment, which is not found in this briefing data. Nor is there the positive Assessment that occurs in Enablement relations, to highlight the value of the information being given, (see Units 11, 12, and 35 in Tape 12).

The type of Assessment in Tape 7 is of the following kind;

Table 10.9. Assessment in Tape 7

Section 1

Unit 5	Assessment of Possible Training Locations

Section 2

Unit 19	Positive feature of Tailorability

Section 3

Unit 24	As an unimportant item
Unit 26	An easy screen
Unit 30	Fairly straight forward again

In Unit 5 it is a low level relation as the client explains the way training is carried out and weighs up the advantages and disadvantages of using the client site or their own office. In Unit 19 it gives a positive Assessment of the feature of tailorability. This is a feature that is recurrently made much of in Tape 12. A comparison of this client's handling of the issue with what occurs in Tape 12 will be made in the next section on intertextual links between the technical writing texts. In section 3 there is more of this relation and it occurs in a similar fashion. It is used by the client to assess the importance or difficulty of what he is showing to the technical writer. It is a feature to be taken up in the next section that these assessments are of negative value. They stress what isn't important, what the technical writer need not worry about too much. It is only by implication then that every other briefing unit is of great importance, but key issues are never identified as such in this briefing. Issues that are complex and are important are not foregrounded.

10.10 Evaluative Analysis

The use of Assessment may be seen as a way into doing an Evaluative analysis of professional communication. In a briefing, especially when the relationship between client and consultant is new, it is really only through the saying of it that a technical writer or a public relations officer can get a sense of what is important to a client. In the next section I will compare this function in the two technical writing texts. Here I want to compare the use of Assessment by the client in this technical writing briefing with its use in the public relations data on Tape 4.

The Units in Tape 4 that are dominated by List - Elaborate structures are as follows.

Table 10.10. Information Structured Units in Tape 4A

Tape 4a. Units 2, 3, 4, 5*, 6*, 7, 8, 9, 11

Assessment, outside of the one Solutionhood relation in Tape 4a, where one finds the expected negative assessment within the solutionhood satellite, is a featured relation in only one Tape 4a unit, Unit 2.

From the above figures it is clear that Derek's brief, introduced by Frank is carried out very much in List - Elaborate, or where starred, Contrast and Elaborate relations. Other prominent relations are

Purpose (Units 3 & 8), Result (Unit 8) and Reason (Unit 7). This brief, as we shall see shortly, focuses more on the topic type briefing question `what is the purpose of this?'. The answer to which is then structured in Purpose or Reason relations.

Assessment is an even less frequent relation in Tape 4a than Tape 7. At most then, Assessment can be seen as an optional feature of a briefing, as compared to an obligatory feature of a draft review unit, where there is usually a direct negative Assessment relation or else a negative Assessment of the draft is to be inferred by the pinpointing of an area of text and offering an improvement to it. This is a visible pattern in the discourse analysis of Tape 1 and the Solutionhood relations identified in the RST analysis of Tape 12. There is, however, a different briefing pattern to be found in Tape 12. Here we see the client using Enablement relations rather than just List - Elaborate schemas to structure his briefing units. This is an indication at least that there are two related ways of doing a briefing, apart from the choice to be monologic or dialogic. Indeed this is less of a choice in a briefing, where a fundamental aspect of the event is that the client or client team has information which is essential to the consultant, be it technical writer, designer or public relations officer. Only in 4c do we see near non monologic briefing taking place, where the facilitator of the meeting has put severe constraints on the time available to discuss the second half of the draft document. The main choice available in a briefing then is to structure the text according to its information content, as we see in 4a and 7, or else to foreground interpersonal rather than just ideational considerations and to show what aspects are highly valued by the client team. This leads to the production of Enablement relations, which, at a top level within a briefing, are inherently evaluative of the material that is the subject mater of the briefing and regularly occur in the company of such evaluative relations as Justify or Positive Assessment.

The evaluative framework I am constructing is that there are two ways of doing a brief. The choice made by the client in Tape 12 seems altogether appropriate. That meeting functions not only to rectify mistakes in the technical writer's draft but also to rectify mistakes or gaps in the earlier briefing from Tape 7. The client's opening assessment of the situation in Tape 12, having read through the draft document produced as a result of the earlier briefing is

> ... I've been through this document once and I've got to be honest and say that I don't really have a feel for it as an overall document.
> (Tape 12, Unit 5, 3)

My candidate reason for the client being in this position is that the briefing in Tape 7, at least the part recorded and available for analysis, has not given the technical writer the means to produce an 'overall document'. All he has been empowered to do is to write a 'how to use the system' document. He has been given little indication of what matters and no indication of important corporate values. It is these failings that the Enablement relations in Tape 12 set about correcting. It is these failings that require briefing units rather than draft review units. It is here that the importance of flexibility is stressed, as a virtue, a selling point of the system that should be foregrounded and reflected in the documentation. It is here that the issues of tailorability and security are not just talked about with an information structure that is determined by the information constituents to be communicated, but are talked about as important features of the system that need foregrounding in the documentation, not just so users know that these features exist, but so that they

> have some appreciation of the power of the software that they're working with
> (Tape 12, Unit 4, 9)

The fact that the client in Tape 12 has to perform this general briefing function is indicative that the briefing in Tape 7 was less than satisfactory as a means of enabling the technical writer to produce an adequate overall document. What I am saying is that the client in Tape 7 took one of the genre options open to him for doing a briefing. He clearly did do it in a generic way as it is so similar in terms of its structuring to the briefing in Tape 4a. However, in an evaluative vein, I am arguing that he made the wrong decision. The type of briefing he chose to conduct was inappropriate, given the communicative event parameters that held for that meeting and given its required outcome.

10.11 A Comparison of the Structuring of the Public Relations Briefing in Tape 4A and the Technical Writing Briefing in Tape 7

In Tape 4a we find two approaches to briefing being given by the two client, working together as a team. Derek's brief in part works like Martin's. Frank's brief manages to give Juliana a sense of the overall purpose of the brochure. This is not a cut and dry split; when Derek produces his first monolog briefing it is also on the purposes of the brochure. Martin, in Tape 7, I conjecture, takes the purpose of the document for granted; it is to inform system users on how the system works. He perceives problems within this framework that he raises for the technical writer to 'bear in mind' (see Chapter 9 on Tape 7 Unit 2), as he is producing instruction manual text, but he doesn't see the potential of the document to do more than instruct on the way to use the system. His boss in Tape 12 puts right what he clearly sees as a missing element from the earlier briefing using Enablement relations to impress the technical writer with the kind of information that needs foregrounding in the document; a sense of company values that should pervade it and make it into an 'overall document'. In Tape 4, because there is a long working history between client and designer and particularly between the public relations officer and the designer the need that is addressed in Tape 12 is already shared knowledge. The designer knows, has helped to create in fact, the client's corporate image through the prospectuses and other documents that she regularly designs for them. The different relation that is upfronted in Tape 4a compared to Tape 7 is that of Purpose. For different reasons then, there is no need for top level Enablement relations in either Tape 4a or Tape 7. A more tangible difference between them can be seen in the Purpose relation, and the function it performs in Tape 4a.

10.12 The Purpose Element in the Public Relations Briefing Data

In Tape 4 most of the monologic units either have a purpose relation or one can see other relations functioning to show the purpose of the documentation. Unit A is a Solutionhood relation. Occurring where it does at the opening of the meeting, and produced by the pro it is a likely site for the provision of general key information for the designer. The Solutionhood relation encodes the lack of suitable documents to support the work which is done by Bob's office; the office of industrial liaison and research support. The solution is this;

> The vision is that we will create a family of mutually supportive documents.
> Tape 4a, Unit 1, 7)

This Solutionhood relation, occurring as it does in a quite different site to those we have described previously in draft review data, encodes no decision proposal for discussion. What it does is present the current agreed Birmingham position on the need for some documentation. The Solutionhood relation then can be seen as providing an answer to the briefing question - 'what is the purpose of this document?'. The use of the Davies topic type model in harness with an RST approach gives us access both to those text units where a purpose relation is encoded and also to those where a purpose function is dominant but yet does not appear in any particular relation in the text.

In Unit 2 there is a mid level Purpose relation in clause 9. First, information is given about the features of the documentation in a basic List - Elaborate structure and then the purpose of it is provided, along with a positive Assessment of the material in clause 10. The purpose in Unit 1 was to provide necessary documentation for the work done by Bob's office. In Unit 2 the purpose is to make the brochure as appealing as possible to a wide range of potential users. Frank explains in this unit that the text is light and the emphasis is on visuals. The text anyway will be written by the pro and argued over, as we see in Tape 4b, by the pro and both Bob and Derek. Clearly this is the reverse of the situation for the technical writing text. The emphasis will be on words and the briefing is to enable the creation of appropriate text. Nevertheless the briefing activity that occurs in Tape 12 makes it clear that attention needs to be paid to the users and the impression the document will have on them and their view of the company that has produced it. The public relations text is designed with the purpose of bringing in business to the university. Bob's document is designed to create initial general interest in working with the University of Birmingham. This is to be achieved through a simple clear message, focusing on different aspects of quality in the University's research and consultancy capabilities. Equally important as the message is the design of the package that carries it. It too must say `quality' and present Birmingham values. This is the central purpose of this brief. Clearly that cannot be the central purpose of a technical writing brief. It has to present accurate and detailed instructional text to system users. Nevertheless what is omitted from the briefing in Tape 7 is any sense that the documentation will reflect on the company; that like it or not, it will have a public relations function. Messages that the Birmingham team are centrally concerned with will be carried by Olympic Resources' user manual whether they like it or not. This is clearly understood in Tape 12 where the client there seeks to exploit this possibility for the good of the company, whereas the strategy adopted in Tape 7 is largely to ignore such matters.

10.13 Applying Topic Type Analysis

To return to an overview of Purpose relations in these two briefings, in Tape 4a, Unit 3 there is a Purpose relation in 6-7 which covers the List relation that precedes it. Again then, information is provided in a List relation but Frank also gives the purpose of the document feature. Here again the purpose is persuasive, but now not aimed at potential users in the market place, but at departmental heads, who, it is hoped, will be encouraged to budget for a similar brochure to Derek's to promote the work they are doing. Unit 4 then focuses on the components of Derek' s folder and Unit 5 details the contrasting ways Derek's and Bob's documents would be used, as does Unit 7. This completes Frank's opening of the brief and at this point Derek takes over. The rhetorical structure of Unit 8 is a three part List relation. The detail has been described in Chapter 9. What each of the List spans encodes however is a Purpose of this document.

In Unit 1 there is a purpose function to the text as a whole but no space for a Purpose relation, and the same is true in Unit 8. The information is structured as a three part List and this is, as I have shown, a typical briefing structure. What it fails to capture however, although it does provide a site for recognising the fact, is that the Unit is encoding the purpose of the document. Again, if the Davies text type model is linked to an RST approach then these core functions of whole texts, that do not show up as a rhetorical relation between parts of the text can be captured. Units 9 and 10 then cover how the new documentation can be used and Unit 11 describes the constituent parts of the document and gives example visuals for it from Derek's collection.

What I am attempting to show in the above text is not just the differences in a public relations brief and a technical writing brief, nor only to find linguistic ways of evaluating the quality of a brief but more importantly to show that rhetorical structure theory, even when applied to monologic data, will not be adequate alone to reveal the range of semantic features that a text incorporates. Just as RST is a useful addition to discourse analysis, so a Florence Davies topic type analysis can enhance both the core analytical approaches of this thesis.

The following table illustrates just how well a text type analysis can be applied to the monologic elements of these two briefing meetings.

Table 10.11. A Topic Type Analysis of Briefing Units in Tape 7 and Tape 4

Tape 4		
What does it do?		
How is it used?	Units	5, 7, 9
What is its purpose?	Units	1, 2 (9), 3 (6-7), 8
What is it / What are its parts?	Units	2, 3, 4, 6, 11, 12
Residue	Unit	10
Tape 7 Section 1		
Company Background?	Units	1, 1a
What does it do?	Units	8, 9
How is it used?	Units	3, 4, 5, 6, 7
What is its purpose?		
What is it / What are its parts?	Units	2
Residue	Unit	10
Tape 7 Section 2		
What does it do?	Units	11, 12, 14, 19
How is it used?	Units	11*, 12, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22
What is its purpose?		
What is it / What are its parts?	Units	11*, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22,
Residue		

Tape 7 Section 3

What does it do?	Units	35, 36
How is it used?	Units	23, 33
What is its purpose?	Units	23*, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 34,
What is it / What are its parts?	Units	23, 24, 26, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34,
Residue	Units	25, 29, 37

I think these figures confirm that there is semantic evidence to regard Tape 4a and Tape 7 as dealing with similar issues. There is a matching range of issues that are dealt with and in each case very little residue of information not fitting the topic type pattern. These are issues that, given a common rhetorical structure of List - Elaborate relations and a common discourse pattern built around inform and elaboration moves can be seen as a basic semantic - sequential structure of the document design activity of briefing; a generic configuration of semantic - sequential structure.

Within the shared pattern, however, the table above highlights interesting differences. The main differences centre on the briefing questions 'what is it's purpose?' and 'what does it do?'. The latter question is addressed throughout Tape 7 but not at all in Tape 4. This is due entirely to the activity in question. A computer system does things, carries out commands and performs operations on data. The same cannot be said for a publicity brochure. The topic type categorisation helps to highlight in linguistic terms basic differences between the two activities under review. To the extent that they can be taken as typical activities for public relations and technical writing, and the public relations data of Tape 1 is of a like nature to Tape 4, then this is a basic subject matter difference for pubic relations and technical writing.

The topic type analysis of the briefing slot 'what is its purpose?' provides even more interesting results. It is an issue of almost equal importance in the public relations data to the most commonly addressed question across the data 'what is it?', which intuitively would seem to be the basic briefing question and the intuition is borne out by the data here. The public relations data then deals predominantly with these two issues, whereas the technical writing data addresses the issues of what it is and what it does. However, there is noticeable variation across the three parts of the technical writing data. In section 1 a different slot, 'company background', is needed to account for the nature of the information requested by the technical writer, regarding the birth, growth and aspirations of the client company. This issue and the system's use are the main focus of section 1. In section 2 when the system is demonstrated, and the client takes over responsibility for the running order of events, concern with company background is dropped and replaced with prime attention given to the main briefing question 'what is it?'. In Section 3, when the client takes the technical writer through the system screen by screen and through each menu, item by item, there is another shift in semantic focus. The question 'what is its purpose?' is addressed for the first time in this briefing. This should provide ground for comparison with the public relations briefing, where the two main issues that structure the content of the briefing appear to be the same.

Using these broad questions to do a text type analysis shows the general similarity, which there is between these two specific enactments of a briefing genre. Turning back to the rhetorical analysis that has been performed on these texts there is a difference in coding there. The purpose relations in Tape 4 are, as detailed above, often coded as purpose relations or else the whole monolog is giving a purpose for the brochure then other relations such as Solutionhood (Unit 1) or List - Elaborate (Unit 8) can carry the purpose function. In Tape 7 section 3, however, what can be categorised as answering the question `what is its purpose?' in a Davies analysis is coded as an Elaboration relation in RST. This is not an error; it is another useful example of how different kinds of analysis complement each other when doing genre analysis. This is because there are indeed fundamental differences in the kind of 'purpose' that is being encoded. Compare the following typical instances.

Tape 7
Unit 23

23. erm ok just go through these one by one account types, . . [2]
24. these just let you identify an account type [laugh]
25. it's as simple as that really

(Tape 7, Unit 23, 23-25)

Unit 30

M
1. I think you've got currency definitions next, . . . [2]
2. again it just lets you set up the currencies you actually want to trade in really

(Tape 7, Unit 30, 1-2)

Tape 4a

Unit 2

7. That's the message.
8. *Very light on pictures er sorry the other way round*

D text

F
8. very light on the words, heavy on pictures, images, impressions.
9. So it can appeal to everybody from the Chamber of Research Council to a chairman of a company, to a technical director everything
10. warm feeling stuff

(Tape 4a, Unit 2, 7-10)

Unit 8

D
1. they're based on considerable interaction with Frank already about this
2. cos we've talked

J yes

D
2. to each other about it
3. the purposes of our publication are first of all to attract collaboration yes

J mm mm

D
4. and it's in the area of bio technology under those three headings and

5. so our target is predominantly industry

(Tape 4a, Unit 8, 1-5)

The Purpose function that can be identified in the technical writing data is only and always a purpose of the particular screen item being displayed and attended to by the client. In RST terms this quite adequately codes as nucleus, the issue to be dealt with plus specification of that issue, coded as Elaboration. So in Tape 7 Unit 23, 23 is the issue, account types, and 24 specifies what this means within the system. The same relation holds between 1 and 2 in Unit 30. In Tape 4a the purposes are of the documentation as a whole. All the examples in Tape 4a are of this nature. Such a clause relation could not be encoded by an Elaboration schema.

10.14 Summary

The harnessing of RST and topic type analysis on this data helps not only to recognise or substantiate claims that these two pieces of data do indeed belong to the same genre, but also as a means of differentiating, in semantic terms, the content differences, that exist between these examples of technical writing and public relations briefing activity. The public relations briefing deals with the desired effects the publication should have. This can be seen in the quoted Purpose relations above. The technical writing briefing, because it is more content heavy, is constrained by the information content that has to be encoded. This means that when purpose does figure as a briefing element, it is not in terms of the purpose or effect that the document is designed to have on its users, but less rhetorically, it figures as a way of specifying functions of the system. Purpose in the technical writing briefing is an information structuring relation, whereas in the public relations data it has a more rhetorical function.

The Purpose relation, as I am using it to code rhetorical structure, is not an information structuring relation in the way that List, Elaborate, Contrast and Sequence are. Neither is it a pragmatic relation along the lines of Enablement or Motivation. Perhaps it can be seen to occupy a middle ground.
It is a relations that does more than encode information structure. There is a stronger interpersonal element to it. It encodes a world view. The purpose relation, just seen within a briefing context, is capable of encoding the speaker's view of how a real world object such as a publication should function. It is overtly doing more than capturing the apparent structure of some object, a brochure or a computer system. Arguably no language use is independent of a world view, but in the case of the Purpose relation that view is

overtly encoded, foregrounded as a key feature of the message that is offered to the receiver.

10.15 Intertextual Relations in the Technical Writing Data

Introduction

In this final section I wish to consider more relations that exist not between generic instantiations of text but between texts that belong to the same professional document design activity. The relations that exist between the draft review and the briefing in the technical writing data may be referred to not as generic but as intertextual (Lemke passim). Unquestionably, what occurs in Tape 12 is in part a consequence of what occurred in Tape 7. As I have documented, there is a genre shift between the two meetings. Tape 7 has functional elements and features that belong to the activity genre of briefing. The desired genre for Tape 12, and the predominant activity structure in that meeting is of draft review. This change can be seen in terms of a shift from chains of inform + acknowledge moves to the production of moves in the decision proposal cycle. Alternatively, it can be viewed as a shift from List - Elaborate structures to Solutionhood structures. Finally, it can be seen as a shift in text type. Tape 7 text very largely fits a half dozen semantic slots, questions that a briefing must address if it is to be a briefing. Tape 12, when it is a draft review, fits a problem solution text pattern, (Hoey 1983, Kay 1991). I have shown that whereas Tape 7, as the opening meeting of this particular document design process, fits the model for a briefing very well, Tape 12 is not so complete an example of a draft review text. Tape 12 takes the mixed form that it has at least partly as a result of the briefing in Tape 7. The intertextual ties that Tape 7 had at the time of its production, with previous briefings either participant had been a member of, will naturally have shaped the dynamic development of that briefing. The same is true of draft reviews in Tape 12. In addition, however, the degree to which Tape 12 can be purely a draft review meeting is conditional on a full and effective brief having been given in Tape 7. The degree to which that meeting was less than successful is one factor that accounts for the briefing activity that occurs in Tape 12.

Another reason why Tape 12 functions as a briefing lies in the nature of the system itself that is the object of discussion. It is a product that is still being developed. New functions are being added and others being replaced. This is an issue, recognised as of key importance by the client in Tape 12 to the way the technical writer should approach his writing task. It is an issue that is foregrounded in Tape 12 and backgrounded in Tape 7. It is dealt with in the opening three monologic Units of Tape 12. In these Units, before turning to the issues raised by the draft text at all, the client produces monolog in two top level Solutionhood relations that deal with the documentation problems that are particular to this system. Part of the problem detailed in Unit 1 is that the company has not been very accurate in its coding (see clause 8). Unit 2 compounds the problem by saying that the system will also need to change (clauses 4-6). Unit 3 is a Restate of the problem (clauses 2-5). The top level relation in

Units 1 and 2 is Solutionhood. This is because problems are not only raised but, albeit at a non specific level, possible solutions, decision proposals, are offered. See Unit 1, clauses 14-15 and Unit 2, clauses 28-35. Unit 3 does restate the problem but it also makes it clear that the specific solution to it is for the technical writer to develop, (clauses 7-8).

What the client does in these opening monologic units is to provide a top level problem for the technical writer to consider; a problem that is likely to shape much of the writing in his text. Although the top level relations are Solutionhood or Restates of Solutionhood relations, which I have designated as generic features of a draft review, that is not the case in these opening sections. Solutionhood text is a common structure for performing draft review genre elements, but this is only true when the issues of the Solutionhood relation relate to offending text. What occurs at the opening of Tape 12 could as easily, and perhaps more profitably, have occurred at the opening of Tape 7. Although the detail of a briefing is likely to be carried by List - Elaborate structures, some sense of direction, a framework for this detail could be given using a top level Solutionhood or Enablement relation. The occurrence of this activity in Tape 12 can be seen as a direct consequence of it not having been performed in Tape 7.

In this section I wish to develop this intertextual approach by looking at a range of key issues that do occur in both Tape 7 and Tape 12 and to examine the different rhetorical frameworks that are used to present the information. I then wish to reverse the process and look at a key relation, Enablement, and the different ways it is made use of in Tape 7 and Tape 12. Through this approach RST will be shown to be a useful means of text analysis for highlighting semantic features in related texts even when not of the same genre. Because Tapes 7 and 12 share the same subject matter, RST can reveal the different treatment given to key issues. It can also be used to show how a common pattern of text structure can be used in quite different ways in related texts in order to show key differences in their enactments.

10.16 Key Issues in the Technical Writing Texts

The key issues that are treated differently in Tapes 7 and 12 are those that are shown to be highly valued in Tape 12, such as tailorability, security and flexibility. The text above shows how the need for flexibility in the documentation is foregrounded as a briefing issue in Tape 12. The client presents it as a problem and outlines a solution for the technical writer to work out in detail. The technical writer is not just being given information on the features of the system to write up in a clear and approachable manner. He is, I think, being asked to produce a manual that will be responsive to the in-built flexibility of the system. Although in Units 1, 2 and 3 this flexibility, this need for change, is presented as a problem for the technical writer to deal with, in other parts of Tape 12 it is presented as a positive feature of the system, as a corporate value that needs to be foregrounded in the manual.

Flexibility

After the introduction of flexibility in the opening units of Tape 12 it is returned to a number of times in the course of the meeting. Units 12, 18, 21, and 32 are all concerned with this feature of the system. All these Units are top level Enablement relations. Their nuclei are as follows.

Unit 12

Again in this section on application codes I'd like to make the point that the size of codes is variable

Unit 18

And certainly that is something that I would like to sell on ... the soft ware can deliver that and again it will cost them some money but I don't want to put them off by saying it's going to be very costly and very time consuming

Unit 21

And again part of the power of the application, I'd like to see it expressed somewhere is the ability to bolt on different trade input processes very easily.

Unit 32

Valuation reports are almost fairly flexible
I just want to make this point in the valuation section

The detail of these texts describes the feature in question in a brief like manner using List - Elaborate structures. In Unit 12, for example, the Enablement nucleus is the initial communication on the topic of application codes. Once the client has made his wishes clear on the issue, that he wants variability to be highlighted, there then follows the Enablement satellite which is basically a two part List structure (9-13), in which the second part is a three part List (11-13). This is typical information structuring as found in Tape 7 also. What is not found in Tape 7 is firstly a top level Enablement relation that is placing a structure on the text that is not simply a reflection of the information content, but which is a pragmatic interpersonal relation that tries to convey the way the client wants the text information to be structured. The top level Enablement relation encodes the world view of the speaker, whereas a briefing unit with only a top level List - Elaborate relation, and with no Purpose relation attached, is conveying information without imposing a world view or a rhetorical position upon it.

The issue of flexibility arises once in Tape 7, in Unit 8.

Tape 7 RST Unit 8

R I've got down here what information do they put in which is obviously details of members

M
1. right in terms of in terms of syndicate investments

R mm hmm

M
2. erm details of erm well with the actual securities that they want to to trade in er,
3. purchase, sell whatever they want to do with them,
4. erm details of the syndicates that they are actually doing it for,
5. for er members agencies

6. that'd be the details of the names they're doing it for,
7. that's a pretty good trio. . . [3]
8. Details of the actual accounts that they want to do the trading for
9. and other accounts that they want to have receive the financial elements from those trades.
10. There's absolute actually

R mm

M
10. Nothing's rigid really in the system

R mm hmm
(Tape 7 RST Unit 8)

This is a rare example of a high level rhetorical relation structuring text in Tape 7. In response to the technical writer's question, Martin opens with a typical briefing structure in 1-9 of a three part List relation with Elaboration relations in the first two spans and another List relation in the third part. This, however, is followed by a lengthy Assessment relation. The Assessment is positive, (clause 10). This is then elaborated on, and Evidence provided that the system can indeed be used flexibly. Perhaps it should be part of the technical writer's professional expertise to pick up on his clients' positive assessments of their own products and to find ways of encoding them into draft texts, or even to find ways of structuring whole texts around such comments. Perhaps however, more realistically, if this client had expected this positive assessment to be transferred to the draft document, then the positive Assessment should have been part of a higher level Enablement relation that did specify what the client actually wanted to find in the text. The client in Tape 12, as we can see from all the top level Enablement nuclei there, is very intent on enabling the technical writer to encode the messages he wants expressed, to foreground some corporate values and selling points of the system, features that will produce a high regard for the client company in the minds of the document users - a goal very similar to the goal of the briefing in the pubic relations data of Tape 4 and the draft review, Tape 1. In Tape 7, however, although the client appears to recognise the importance of flexibility and positively assesses it in his briefing, he does nothing overtly to bring about its inclusion in any way in the documentation.

Tailorability and Security

These issues are brought to the fore in Unit 4 of Tape 12, which has been thoroughly described in Chapter 9. The top level pragmatic relations that structure this unit are Enablement and Justification. It opens with this text.

> but I'm keen for the users to read something like that
> (Tape 12, Unit 4, 1)

What follows is text that justifies this position. The text quoted above functions as a decision proposal, with what follows it as far as clause 16 functioning as DP support. This monolog is not item initial as many of the top level pragmatically organised units are. It opens with a presequence from the client that establishes that the briefing that Martin gave to the technical writer contained information that Martin's boss, the client in Tape 12, does not agree with. Richard answers the initial question on tailorability by saying it will go into an appendix, and this response gets support from Martin. This would be an acceptable solution except that the client here wants this information up front

> in a location where they are not going to be forced to read it but they are going to read it ... if it's tucked away in an appendix.
> (Tape 12, Unit 4, 5-7)

As detailed in Chapter 9, the use of the top level Compare relation puts the issue of Security in the same category as Tailorability. It too is covered by the initial decision proposal not to be tucked away in an appendix but to be put in an available position to the reader. The Justification for the client's position on tailorability reads as follows.

> if they've got an appreciation of how flexible it is [the system] in certain areas then you know that's going to help them appreciate the software a little bit more in their organisation and maybe even enable them to see it as achieving a solution without them having to go out and do you know further development.
> (Tape 12, Unit 4, 13-16)

The client's reason then is twofold. He wants the user to get the most out of the system and also he wants to increase the user's regard for the system, and by implication for the company that has produced both the system and such consciousness raising documentation for it. The decision proposal is accepted by Martin and the technical writer. Nevertheless the client still completes his Restate of his positive assessment of this feature. Security he says is an integral feature, `a common element across all the products that we develop' (ibid, 36). It is natural enough then that the issue is raised again periodically in this meeting as the client starts to deal with individual issues. He has raised a positive feature of the system which is a common feature across all their systems. It is raised to the level of a corporate value by the client's insistence that it be given prominence, a section to itself in the documentation.

The issue is raised again in Units 8 and 11. In Unit 8 the client is performing the basic draft review activity. The top level relation is one of Solutionhood, and the issue of tailorabilty occurs in the Solutionhood nucleus, as part of the decision proposal as to what information needs to be stressed regarding the command line. Unit 11 is a briefing unit. It opens after another interactive presequence initiated by the client which confirms the fact that the issue of organisations has not been covered in the earlier briefing. Martin's excuse for this omission, apparently accepted by his boss is that at the time of the earlier meeting `that wasn't part of the system'. This bears out the client's point at the opening of this meeting that the documentation needs to be able to cope with this flexible system building that is a characteristic of the company. The issue of tailorability is raised as a Summary of one issue in the three part List structure that comprises the Enablement satellite. The main case for tailorability has been made and here we find proof that it does occur across the system. In this

Unit, as a top level part of the Enablement satellite, tailorability functions as an issue to be written about in the context of organisations.

In all three occurrences of the issue the client is proposing to put it into the text both as a section in its own right and as a positive feature connected to a range of other aspects of the system. It is talked about in the context of decision proposals, whether they be to change the draft text or to enable new information to go into the next draft. This information may be a positive aspect of a part of the system, such as organisations or it may be to justify a rhetorical foregrounding of this feature, to give it some corporate value in the documentation. This environment needs then to be compared with the way the issue is discussed in Tape 7.

In Tape 7 there are two units where the issue of tailorability is discussed and one where securities is mentioned. These are Units 18 and 19 for tailorability, and Unit 21 for securities. All these Units have top level List - Elaborate relations. Immediately that tells us that it is likely that nothing more is being done about this issue than mentioning it alongside other features of the system. In Unit 18, the client offers information about the menus, that they are all tailorable. The mention comes in clause 3, the nucleus of the second part of a three part List relation that constitutes this monolog. The point is elaborated in clauses 4-6. This elaboration satellite specifies what is changeable about the menus. Then 7-10 moves on to another issue. This then is a brief mention. The client can say he has briefed the technical writer on the tailorability issue, but in no way has he drawn his attention to the importance this feature might have either as a widespread system feature or as a prestigious feature that the company might want to boast of in the documentation. The second occurrence is at the end of the next monologic unit. Here it again occurs in a List - Elaborate structure but this time it is the nucleus of a positive Assessment of the features in the list. The client has shown how various commands work and ends the brief unit with a positive assessment of these features, which is that they are all tailorable (clause 48 & 51). The client, then, can be seen to hold this feature in positive regard. It isn't ignored in his brief, indeed it is the grounds for positive assessment of the system. Nonetheless, it is still far short of impressing the technical writer with the scope of this item or its value to the company. There is no decision proposal attached to the item. As has been detailed in Chapter 9, the client is providing *information* for the technical writer to bear in mind, without helping much to prioritise the items or to give the technical writer a framework on which to construct `an overall text'.

The issue of security is briefly raised in the following monolog but one, Unit 21. Again, this is a top level List relation with List and Elaborate relations within it. The issue of Security arises in clauses 6-9. This is the second part of a List relation that is embedded in the top level List structure of this unit. It is just one more item dealt with briefly as the client takes the technical writer through the screen. The point made to the technical writer is

yeah, don't worry about security
(Tape 7, Unit 21, 6)

Here the client is not simply failing to prioritise or foreground what could be key issues of the documentation, if it were to have a high profile rhetorical organisation, rather he is directing the writer to ignore the issue, not to worry about it. We saw earlier how the client's Assessments in this meeting are usually that something is simple or easy. It may be helpful to try and reduce the magnitude of the technical writer's task but it would undoubtedly help more to tell him which items were of key importance.

The client in Tape 7 is misinforming the writer, at least in the context of the view of the documentation that his boss holds and which will prevail in Tape 12. He does this clearly in Unit 21 on the topic of security and also misinforms in Units 5 and 19 by failing to prioritise the huge amount of information that he is directing at the technical writer as briefing material to be kept in mind.

10.17 The Enablement Relation across the Technical Writing Data

A. At a High Level

Having looked at similar issues treated in different rhetorical structures in Tapes 7 and 12. I now wish to turn to the way the same rhetorical structure is used to deal with different issues and at a different organisational level in the text hierarchy.

I have already looked in some detail at the use of the Enablement relation in Tape 12. It functions as a high or top level relation. When it occurs within a top level Solutionhood relation it is the relation that enables the technical writer to produce the Solution, the decision proposal requested by the client that will improve the draft text. When it occurs as a top level relation then it is usually performing a briefing rather than draft review function. It can provide the technical writer with a framework of company values on which to structure a complete document or less grandiosely, it lets the writer know what the company wishes to foreground about itself, the messages the client wants his customers to receive about his company in the documentation.

Enablement is also a commonly occurring relation in Tape 7. As both occur within a briefing context, an examination of the differences in their occurrences should reveal more key differences between these two texts. These differences will be analysed in terms of what it is that is being enabled by the relation, and whereabouts in the text structure the relation occurs. For Tape 12 this has already been stated.

In Tape 7 there are three top level Enablement relations; Units 2, 11 and 17. Unit 2 has already been looked at in some detail in the previous chapter. This Unit does function much as the Enablement relations in Tape 12. The Enablement satellite offers detail on the investment system. This detail regarding the range of users is to be used by the technical writer to address the issue that Martin wants him to address, which occurs in the Enablement nucleus; should there be one manual or two. This nucleus does encode something like a decision proposal, albeit a more tentative one than those produced by the client in Tape 12.

39. Perhaps if we put the emphasis on producing a manual for the for the syndicate investments

R mm

M
40. erm Once we are there
40a. we can then move chunks out of it if you like

R yes

M
41. to produce a manual
42. perhaps me and yourselves

R yeah

M
43. erm to suit other other market places

R right erm

M
44. I don't know what if you have any suggestions on that.

(Tape 7, Unit 2, 37-44)

The client then justifies this position, that two manuals may be required. The technical writer's response to this monolog is to treat it as a briefing unit. It is information `to bear in mind'. He hasn't been given orders, he has been informed of issues that ought to impinge on the way he structures the document. The technical writer's response is very much the response that the client in Tape 12 wishes to produce with his early Enablement text structures. Compare Tape 12, Unit 2.

27. but erm we are going to expand upon the number of options

28. and because that's that's true in a couple of instances there
29. I'm wondering whether there's an alternative mechanism that you might be able to explore
30. and I'm not as I'm not suggesting anything here

M mmm

T
31. but there might be some mechanism that you can sort of explore
32. and sort of say
33. well we could format in a different way
34. so that whatever whichever options you put in there you know
35. this documentation will will relate to it . . . [2]
36. I know I'm throwing something quite difficult at you

R mmm

T
37. because from your point of view
38. I know that you're looking at the screen
39. and saying by taking that option
40. you're going to a particular location

M yes yeah

T
41. whereas I'm almost saying what I'd like to do is say you know
42. you as a user find out what the appropriate option is
43. to produce a valuation
44. and taking that will take you here

R right

T
45. I'm not saying that you can achieve
46. what I'm asking you to do either

R mmm

T
47. I'm just kicking that in as a comment right
48. you don't have to explore it in any great depth with me here and now,
49. just asking you to perhaps give that some thought

R mmm

T
50. and see if there are any suggestions or alternatives that we can come up with

(Tape 12, Unit 2, 27-50)

Both the briefing units in these two meetings, encoded with top level Enablement relations are only asking the technical writer to consider the issue. He hasn't been given firm and fast directions, as is the case in Tape 12, both when the draft review activity is taking place and on occasion during briefing units where the client is more assured of what he wants to see in the document. Briefing units of this kind provide the technical writer with the information and the company position on an issue and then leave him to come up with the specifics of the solution.

The second top level Enablement relation in Tape 7 is Unit 11. This has also been described in some detail in Chapter 9. This is more basically a top level List-Elaborate relation, a typical briefing unit in Tape 7, describing the functioning of the system. The opening four clauses of the monolog, however, provide a top level Enablement nucleus of a kind.

M
A. I thought I might show you some of the system, erm . . [2]
B. show you how a bit of the members' system first
C. and show you how the help text works.
D. I'm not sure how to turn this system on.

(Tape 7, Unit 11, A-D)

This is an Enablement nucleus in that what follows in the satellite will enable the technical writer to use the system and that being so enabled will allow him to produce documentation on the system. What such an Enablement nucleus lacks is a sense of direction, a sense of prioritisation which we find in Tape 12. It merely provides a lead in to doing a List based brief, here accompanied by the sequence relation which is encoding the information structure of the staged set of actions necessary to boot the system. There is no rhetorical organisation of the material from the client. The information itself, the features of the system, is allowed to structure the talk with no direction or emphasis from the client. This Enablement relation is more typical of the briefing units to be found in Tape 7. This type of relation also occurs lower down the text hierarchy. It does not need to occupy a potentially text organising position, it can be a local feature of text patterning within top level List - Elaborate structures, as we shall see later.

The third and final top level Enablement relation in Tape 7 is Unit 17. Again, the Enablement nucleus is almost an aside comment rather than a serious attempt to give a framework for the writing task.

M
1. Anyway erm right umm to get into it, just talk a little bit about the action bars and how you can sort of manoeuvre around those

R mm hmm

M
2. once you get into them,
3. ought to cover in the introduction. [2]
3a OK erm once they sign on to the system whatever way they sign on
4. they'll come into this screen

(Tape 7, Unit 17, 1-4)

1-3 provides the nucleus and 4 is the opening of what can be seen as a lengthy List structured satellite that not only includes the rest of Unit 17, but also Units 18 and 19, which are also concerned with providing briefing information for the technical writer on the functioning of the system's action bars. The nucleus is in two parts. 1-2 say what will be enabled in the satellite to follow, and 3 gives some indication of where the client would like to see this information occur in the documentation. Similar wishes are expressed in Tape 12, but they usually receive more prominence, more careful structuring than this example. Take the nucleus of the Enablement relation in Unit 11 of Tape 12 as an example.

T

53. again . . . [2] in terms of documenting that within the user manual
54. I don't know whether it organisations will go in as a subsection

M I would put it in as a section in its own way actually

T

55. and again you know I suppose that what we would like to do is to try and qualify some of that power that we've got there,
56. without going into too much detail

(Tape 12, Unit 11, 53-56)

The topic is similar, the placing of the information that occurs in the Enablement satellite. In 55-56 however we see the client here give some rhetorical structuring to the information he has presented. Instruction at this level of generality can only be helpful to a technical writer. It doesn't tell him what to write but it gives him a sense of the client company's priorities; not just what they want to see in the text but the way they want it to appear, the kind of effect they want it to produce.

B. Low Level Enablement Relations in Tape 7

There are a number of instances where low level Enablement relations occur in Tape 7. These are absent from Tape 12. In these relations we find the client not structuring text around an Enablement relation, but in the course of detailing the system, showing the technical writer how parts of it work. Low level Enablement occurs in the following Units.

Table 10.12. Low Level Enablement relations in Tape 7

Section 1	-
Section 2	12, 13, 15, 19, 20
Section 3	33, 35

The relation is noticeably and accountably absent from Section 1. As this deals with background information on the company, there is no system to be explained and demonstrated to the writer. The majority of occurrences come in Section 2 where Martin introduces the system to the technical writer, with a couple more instances in Section 3 as they `plough through the system'. I will take a pair of examples from Section 2 to show what this relation is doing in a technical writing brief.

Unit 12 is a typical briefing unit. It has a top level List structure with five parts to it, each of which is either structured as another List structure and/or as an Elaboration schema. Within the second, third and fourth of these List structures there are low level Enablement relations. These occur at such a low level in the structure of the text that they are not text organising features. They are, however, typical features of the briefing in Tape 7, and perhaps typical features of a technically oriented brief in general. They are not to be found in Tape 12 in that this is more a rhetorical brief, informing the technical writer on company priorities and issues of image rather than on the detailed functioning of the system. Additionally when the client in Tape 12 does describe a feature of the system in some detail, the unit on organisations for example (Unit 11), he is not enabling the technical writer to work through that part of the system on the screen. The detail is described and then there is an Enablement nucleus that informs the writer on how the client would like to see the issue handled within the text (Unit 11, 53-57).

The Tape 7 briefing lacks this rhetorical level of organisation that is prevalent in Tape 12. In contrast it has a strong `how to' structure which is carried by top level List - Elaborate relations within which the `how to' detail occurs in low level Enablement relations. Here are two examples from Unit 12.

M

13. so if you want go edit something to number two
14. number two will let you actually update that item
15. so you select the item for update basically

R mm hmm

M
16. so pull out all details that sit behind this summary

R right

M
17. change what you want to change

R
18. and the ones involved are things that you can change

M
18. yeah the fields highlighted are ones that you can change

(Tape 7, Unit 12, 13-18)

13-14 provides the low level nucleus of this relation. It describes the function that can be performed. 15-18 is the satellite, it gives the 'how to' information.

Another similar example occurs in the fourth part of the top level List relation of the same unit.

44. this is help text for the screen?
R right
M
45. which in this case is again sorry is F2 the standard help
R mm hmm
M
46. =so what you do is
47. stick that window over the top . . . [8]
48. you can actually get more than just one window of help.

(Tape 7, Unit 12, 44-48)

44-45 is the nucleus. Enabling the help function is the feature being described, and 46-48 is the Enablement satellite that informs the technical writer how to do it.

This then is a recurring feature of the client's brief in Tape 7. He enables the client to produce a system manual by showing him how the system works and enabling him to use it. In terms of strategy, this might be seen as a simple approach to doing a brief. It is simpler than the public relations brief in Tape 4 in that it does not encode a sense of purpose for the document beyond the obvious one of enabling the user to actually use the system. It is simpler than the brief in Tape 12 in that it lacks a sense of direction applied to the raw data. It lacks a concern for the positive effects a good manual could have, which are handled in the top level pragmatic relation of Enablement in Tape 12.

The Enablement relations detailed above from Tape 7 are not adequately powerful in the meeting to be accorded the status of a generic functional element. They can rather be seen as what Lemke describes as `rhetorical structures', units of text structure smaller than generic functional elements. These are structures which could occur in any number of different genres and would be constituent parts of generic functional elements dependent on the context of occurrence. So here in Tape 7 they are part of the functional element of a briefing unit which has the overall structure of a List - Elaborate relation. It is top level organising rhetorical relations that encode functional generic elements. So the inform + elaborate structure revealed by discourse analysis in the public relations briefing can also be constructed in monolog out of top level List - Elaborate structures and out of top level Enablement structures. Within the List - Elaborate pattern that is prevalent in Tape 7 we find lower level Enablement relations regularly occurring, as constituent parts therefore of the basic briefing element that is constituted by the List relation. It is top level rhetorical structures that carry generic elements and regularly occurring low level relations such as Enablement in Tape 7 can be accorded the Lemkean status of `rhetorical structures' (Lemke 1990a).

In the last part of this chapter I have attempted to take less of a generic view of the relations between texts and to compare and contrast texts that have intertextual relations as well as generic ones. This has allowed a focus on text differences that arise at different stages of one document design process, rather than on similarities that occur at similar stages of different document design activities. This has highlighted strategic differences in the way an activity is encoded. Tape 7 can be viewed as a brief entire to itself but Tape 12 has a hybrid structure of brief and draft review largely because of its intertextual links with Tape 7. Features covered in Tape 7, the detailed description of the system with top level List relations and lower level Enablement relations can be omitted. Features such as tailorability and flexibility that arose in the earlier brief, but not in a way to effect the structuring of the technical writer's text needed to be dealt with in Tape 12 again and in differently organised text structures to highlight the rhetorical value of such features to the client.

10.18 Conclusion

Rhetorical Structure Theory is shown by this thesis to be applicable to spoken data. This then satisfies, or partly satisfies, one of Mann & Thompson's aims in developing the theory. I have only applied it to text that I call monolog. Applying it consistently to two party or multi party talk lies beyond the scope of this thesis and may yet prove problematic for RST. It is by no means clear that types of spoken discourse where turns and speaking time are shared more equally than in this technical writing data will prove amenable to a type of analysis that relies on text being constructed with a purpose in mind. In dialogue purpose may well be negotiated in a dynamic sense that would resist RST analysis. The attempt to apply it may well highlight interesting differences between spoken and written modes of communication.

This thesis also shows RST to be a useful element of genre analysis. It has highlighted generic features of briefings in particular and of draft review which would have resisted detailed accurate analysis from a discourse perspective alone. Top level rhetorical structures are indicative of functional elements of generic structure being enacted. The differences and the similarities of top level relations that have been demonstrated for the four meetings analysed in this chapter provide strong evidence of this. The basic division of relations into semantic and pragmatic (Mann &Thompson 1988, Ford 1987, Stewart 1987) has proved useful too in this respect, as has the notion that top level relations will tend to collocate frequently with a specific range of others.

RST has allowed this thesis to advance the analysis of monolog. It is clearly insufficient to treat it entirely as being like dialogue. It is also insufficient to ignore the ongoing interaction into which monologs are set (Stewart 87, Kumpf 86). Monologs have an interactive significance that is not revealed necessarily in a sequential fashion. It is not until the unit is complete and has been accepted into the ongoing talk in some way that it can be said to have interactional significance at all. Monolog can be seen as a way of holding up the sequential pattern of making sense of talk and allowing a transfer to a semantic mode, to recognising what relations are being posited to hold between what units and in what kind of a hierarchic structure before the talk can be seen to have a functional role in the interrupted but ongoing interaction. It is in this way that this thesis has melded clause relational analysis with discourse analysis. Because the data is spoken, I have taken the reverse route to Hoey (Hoey 86). He sees the need to subsume discourse patterns within clause relations and that may prove productive for handling narrative within a novel, where the overarching mode is written with sporadic pieces of spoken talk inserted in it. Where the containing mode is spoken, or more to the point is dialogic and interactive with occasional long turns taken that can be analysed as monolog the the pattern needs to be reversed and clause relations made subservient to discourse structure into which they must be resolved for the ongoing interaction to be made sense of.

1. I will, however, continue to use the general term `semantic analysis' to describe a clause relational approach to text in contrast to the discourse analytic perspective that has been pursued in the first half of this thesis.

2. For a detailed analysis of draft review using these discourse analytic terms see Chapter 7.

3. For the discourse analysis chapter it proved sufficient to break tape 4 down into just two sections. The occurrence of monolog however justifies splitting 4b into two sections; b and c.

CHAPTER 11 CONCLUSION

11.1 The Findings: A Summary

There is strong academic interest in professional communication. However very little of this work has provided linguistic analysis of the micro detail of such communication or attempted to design and develop suitable kinds of analysis for such work. The aims of this thesis have been to tackle both these weaknesses. The data presented the problem of dealing with two very different kinds of interaction; one largely interactive and the other largely monologic. A framework was needed that would highlight both similarities and differences across related types of professional communication. No one method of analysis was going to be adequate for this task. A principal feature of the analysis to be found in this thesis is the use of several interlocking approaches. The aim of each chapter is to show generic features of part of the document design process in either technical writing or public relations. To accomplish this, Part One uses discourse analysis linked with topic type analysis and Part Two uses Rhetorical Structure Theory linked with topic type analysis, while building on the findings from Part One.

Chapter One locates the work as being firstly data driven, and secondly, as dealing with professional communication. Thirdly it outlines the scope of the thesis which is to apply linguistic analysis to the data in order to discover generic features of the work practices that it constitutes. It locates the focus of activity in this thesis as moving genre analysis away from highly revered written text forms to processual spoken interaction. The chapter builds up a conceptual basis to support this activity, using Bakhtin, Miller, Swales and Hallidayan linguistics. Chapter One also takes issue with conversation analytic approaches to spoken interaction, a dominant paradigm at present, and builds a case against CA for being unable or unwilling to produce results at a generic level of analysis. This thesis takes issue with one fundamental CA principle which is the centrality of casual conversation, as a form of interaction against which all other talk should be measured. Giddens concept of structuration (Giddens 1979) is used to support textual analysis that will not manacle itself to the CA insistence on participants' demonstrable orientation to what is occurring interactionally.

Chapter Two introduces the discourse analytical framework on which Part One of this thesis is built. It offers an entry level workable functional description of the highly interactive talk that makes up the public relations corpus of data. In order to build a generic analysis from this approach discourse analysis is joined with topic type analysis. This led to the recognition of regularly occurring large scale sequential units that operate as functional generic elements of document design interaction.

Chapters Three and Four discuss relevant work to this thesis. Chapter Four describes the changing nature of work done in the field of Organizational Communication. There is a shift away from experimentally controlled decontextualised studies of decision making in favour of context sensitive approaches that require detailed micro analysis of authentic interaction sequences. Concern now is with recognising types of group and types of task bringing about types of interaction. This is the area investigated by this thesis. Are there regular types of interaction that occur when similar types of group are involved in tasks that share a similar purpose? Can differences in interaction patterns produced by such groups be attributed to important contextual variables? The genre analysis of this thesis answers positively to the above questions.

Chapter One makes use of Structuration theory to give conceptual support to a discourse analytic genre approach in preference to Conversation Analysis. Chapter Four reports on the use made of Structuration theory to account for what particular groups do when they interact in terms of local task components rather than as conforming to decontextualised abstract models (Poole 1985, Poole and De Sanctis 1990, Yates and Orlikowski 1992). Poole and Giddens in particular provide a macro level theory for generic activity in group interaction. This thesis provides a new analytical approach to organizational interaction data and analysis of such data to give detailed substance to genres of interaction within the activity of document design.

Chapter Three is a survey of register and genre analysis over the past two decades and of the rather sparse discourse analytic work, at least up until the late 1980s that has made use of these concepts. The chapter provides a comprehensive survey of Hallidayan approaches to register and the Hallidayan school's work on genre. Martin and Ventola's work has been at the forefront of attempts to describe spoken interaction in terms of genre. This is coupled with a review of the less linguistically centred work of John Swales which still provides a staged view of genre as a goal oriented activity but from a less textually and more rhetorically centered perspective. The Sydney school approach to genre has been found encouraging in terms of its solid linguistic framework but too rigid a tool for the kind of social activity this thesis deals with. This thesis has recognised and worked with the need for genre to be thought of as a flexible unit (Lemke 1991). Only in this way can the range of document design activities be seen to have generic qualities at all. Chapter Five is the most rigid discourse analytic approach to genre, successful because of the constrained nature of the design activity of doing a presentation. Chapters Six and Seven recognise and defend the need for more flexible approaches to be taken; to recognise that genre elements can be realised by more than one type of linguistic structure.

Chapters Five, Six and Seven present detailed discourse analysis of public relations document design activity. Chapter Five deals with presentation activity. As well as describing generic features of this kind of interaction, Chapter Five also addresses the issue of negotiation as a linguistically produced activity. This makes a link with organisational communication work on negotiation and decision making (Morley & Stephenson 1977, Brandstatter et al 1982) and non generic linguistic work on the topic (Firth 1991, Lampi 1986). Rather than discuss the nature of negotiation in general terms however, the chapter locates it specifically within the activity type or genre of doing a presentation. The chapter argues that it is the activity itself that needs to be described as regular purposeful interaction rather than the abstract concept of negotiation. The three different presentation meetings are each shown to consist of the same five topic types. Additionally these topic types are shown to have a regular internal structure in terms of obligatory and optional elements that are realised by discourse analytic moves. Decision making is shown to occur only within certain of these topic types and to be initiated only by non presenting participants. Variety is also found within the presentations in terms of how the decision making is resolved. This is accounted for in terms of the stage of the proceedings at which the presentation occurs. At an early stage problems may be left unresolved, at a late stage they are dealt with immediately.

Chapter Five suggests that quite a rigid approach to genre in terms of topic type and their internal organisation might be effective. The other public relations data, dealt with in Chapters Six and Seven, and the technical writing data, however, demanded a more flexible approach. All three Presentations are examples of both the same activity type and the same topic type. While the two briefings dealt with in Chapter Six are members of the same social activity, they belong to different text types. Briefing 2 is basically a decision making text type whereas Briefing 1 is not. Briefing 1 is constructed with almost no decision making topics. The decision making in Briefing 2 is the obstacle to a smooth running of the talk. The need for it can be locally and contextually accounted for in terms of the difference in information status between the two Briefings. In Briefing 1 the information to be passed on to the designer has already been agreed between the client team whereas in Briefing 2 this is not the case. What one sees in these two texts is variation in enactment that is locally brought about. This variation can be seen as allowable generic variation in order to deal strategically with local differences that exist in the two contexts of situation in which the Briefings occur. The presence of hybrid topics in Briefing 2 illustrates that participants are not tied into a generic straightjacket. They can opt for one kind of activity or another, depending on their strategic reading of the situation. This kind of choice is made very apparent by the method of analysis used in this thesis and is a necessary feature of a flexible, not formally rigid approach to speech genres.

Chapter Six provides the most detailed description of the data in Part One of this thesis. It is evidence of the effectiveness of the analytical techniques employed to access generically functioning stretches of discourse. The Chapter demonstrates what a document design briefing sets out to achieve and some of the strategic variation available within the genre to reach those goals.

Chapter Five has looked at data that are of the same social activity and have similar textual characteristics. Chapter Six details generic features of texts that belong to the same social activity but which do not exhibit such close textual similarities. Chapter Seven completes the set of choices by examining texts that enact different social actions, a briefing and a draft review, but which make use of a similar text type, decision making.

Decision making is shown to a recognisable text type in this Chapter, with routes open through it dependent on the kind of social activity it is being used to enact. Reasons why one route is open in a briefing but not in a draft review, opening only with a problem statement for example, can be assigned to the staging of the activity. That an activity is goal oriented and staged are Jim Martin's defining genre characteristics (Martin 1985). It is apposite therefore that staging should account for differences in available options for moving through a decision making text. Within an overall pattern of similarity between Briefing 2 and the Tape 1 Draft Review there are also clear differences. Decision proposals are more definite in the draft review. Only the Briefing opens with a problem statement. Only the client initiates decisioning activity in the Briefing whereas both client and pro initiate in the Draft Review. A Flowchart description is used in this chapter to highlight these features of the social activity that determine how the text type that embodies them both is to be negotiated.

Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten, Part Two of this thesis, introduce a new way of analysing the data. This coincides with a shift in emphasis to technical writing. It is the preponderance of monologic interaction, however, that necessitated the development of a new approach. Rhetorical Structure Theory is successfully applied to spoken discourse in a way that evinces generic features of the interaction in a non sequential way. This is a new application of RST in two ways. Firstly, it has rarely been applied to spoken data before and never to ongoing interaction. Secondly, RST is used to evidence non sequential generic features that are to be found in the way the monologs are structured. Solutionhood units are found in draft review activities. List - Elaborate structures predominate in simple briefings while Enablement structures indicate a more persuasive briefing strategy. This RST approach to the data has been developed and used as part of an interlocking set of analytical techniques to recognise genre characteristics in complex spoken interaction.

Chapter Eight details Mann and Thompson's Rhetorical Structure Theory, which is used to provide a semantic and pragmatic analysis of the technical writing data to interface with the sequential method of analysis that was developed in Part One. It is because RST is both a semantic and pragmatic system of analysis, and that it can account for every part of the text, that it is to be preferred to other clause relational approaches, notably that of Hoey and Winter in a genre analysis context. Before this thesis very little work had been done using RST for genre analysis or to account for spoken data, although Mann and Thompson regularly make calls for both to be done.

Chapter Eight also makes use of the work of Jay Lemke to support a non sequential approach towards genre analysis. He calls for a more semantically based approach. Activity genres, according to Lemke and Hasan, should regularly say 'similar kinds of things about similar phenomena'. (Lemke 1988). It is this area of similarity that is captured through RST. Lemke also defends the idea that an activity genre can be constructed 'in many ways, by many actual sequences of actions', (Lemke 1990). This is an issue that arose even in Part One of this thesis. It had to be fully addressed in Part Two where *Briefings* and *Draft Reviews were occurring* as part of technical writing *document design processes but* in a monologic rather than interactive format.

Chapter Eight also reintroduces the notion of Topic Type analysis, this time in a more traditional manner, in terms of information constituents that are likely to occur in different text types. This version of topic type analysis is used as support for RST and completes a triangulation of analytical approaches to the data of this thesis, all in search of generic linguistically discoverable features.

Chapter Nine provides detailed RST analysis of monologic talk from the four pieces of interaction that are being dealt with; a Briefing and a Draft Review from both a technical writing and a public relations source. The Chapter is evidence of the mechanics of RST and its workability when applied to professional talk. Previous RST studies of spoken language have dealt with free standing units. Here the monologs are seen as having sequential value as part of the ongoing types of interaction they form a part of. Monologic talk resists a straightforward discourse analytic interpretation. There is a lack of cues and signals that indicate what meanings have been produced. According to RST, the meaning of the monologic text builds up hierarchically rather than sequentially. According to this thesis it is this hierarchically structured element of talk that then has to be fit into the ongoing interaction, accepted at face value by interlocutors or retroactively renegotiated in some way.

Chapter Ten builds on the work of Chapters Eight and Nine to offer a genre and intertextual study of professional document design texts. It shows how key top level relations such as Solutionhood in Draft Review and Enablement particularly as part of briefing activity convey similar information about similar kinds of entity and thus fulfil the Lemke - Hasan criterion for establishing textual rather than sequential generic textual features. Part Three and Four of Chapter Ten present an evaluative approach to genre analysis using features of text made prominent by RST analysis. An RST approach shows how similar issues can be handled with different top level relations and conversely how the same rhetorical structure, such as Enablement, can be used in quite different ways across texts. The importance of not relying solely on one type of analytical method is also demonstrated. Topic type analysis shows content level differences between the public relations and the technical writing briefs. It also shows similarities that can be missed using RST. The importance of the Purpose relation for example. This is not always made prominent by RST if there is no item of text to form a purpose relation, even if the whole text has a purpose orientation.

By the end of Chapter Ten three alternative ways of making intertextual comparisons between Tape Seven and Tape Twelve have been made available. Firstly there are differences in the discourse patterning. An inform Plus elaborate pattern gives way to a decision making pattern. Secondly there is a change in top level rhetorical structure text organisation. List-Elaborate patterns give way to Solutionhood relations. Thirdly there is a change in information constituents as made visible by text type analysis. Briefing text slots are replaced by problem - solution text type slots.

Part Two of this thesis seeks to subsume a clause relational analysis within a broader sequential interactive discourse analysis. This is the opposite route to that taken by Hoey (Hoey 86). This thesis concludes that the solution to the way these types of analysis should be interwoven will not be a once and for all decision, but will depend on text qualities. Interactive texts, most typically associated with spoken language use, need an overall interactive analytical framework, within which a clause relational approach can be subsumed. Texts such as Hoey's examples, where sequential meaning is less prominent and a hierarchical build up of meaning occurs, most typically associated with written language use may require the reverse approach.

11.2 IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Discourse Based Approaches to Genre

This thesis contributes, I believe, to a number of research fronts. Foremost, in the area of genre analysis it is an attempt to deal with a complex cluster of spoken activities from a generic standpoint. Much of the previous linguistically oriented research into genres of spoken interaction has, in order to develop and demonstrate a systemic theory of genre, dealt with more straightforward and much shorter stretches of talk such as the service encounter (Ventola 1987). The scope of the data has demanded a less rigid approach, and made necessary a number of interlinked approaches to capture similarities and differences within the interactive processes that are dealt with here. Lemke has argued convincingly (1988b) for this relaxed approach to genre. He claims that 'genre structure elements can be realised by more than one possible rhetorical structure' (ibid, p.164). This thesis has put flesh on these bones by developing an analytical tool that shows a range of potential rhetorical structures that may function as generic elements. The utilisation of topic type analysis and of topic type as a genre element has provided a most useful bridge between the sequential discourse analytic approach of Part One of this thesis and the semantic, rhetorical approach of Part Two.

Discourse analysis is clearly able to provide a working functional description of the interactive practices in the public relations data. By itself, removed from a rank scale model, this is a low level description. This thesis shows that reconnected with a discourse level, rather than a grammatical level approach to text structure, that generic units of text are identifiable. More text centered work from a range of contexts is needed to show the extent of the validity of the approach that has been engineered here.

A Rhetorical Structure Approach to Genre

Part One of this thesis provides solid evidence that genres of document design do exist and are locatable through text analysis. Part Two builds on these findings. It shows that Rhetorical Structure Theory is applicable to spoken language and that it can be useful to genre analysts. Again more application over a range of contexts is required to determine the extent of the RST potential.

This thesis also claims, through RST,to have made advances in the study of monologic interaction. As pointed out elsewhere in this thesis, little work has been done in this area since Coulthard and Montgomery (1981). Without a means to deal with this phenomenon, data such as the technical writing corpus for this thesis becomes unmanageable to discourse analyst and CA practitioner alike. CA maintains the position of treating monolog like any other sort of talk, which does not seem to have been very successful. The hierarchic semantic approach to text units offered by RST is applicable to monolog. In this thesis the meaning unit analysis offered by RST is then taken as having sequential significance as a whole. The sequential relevance of what is said in monolog is viewed as being on hold until the hierarchic semantic unit of text has been completed. At this point the monolog becomes assignable a sequential function. This may be the function desired by its producer or not. In either case, again in agreement with a view of text taken by Lemke (1991), meaning is assignable retrospectively.

This thesis has focused on generic and intertextual links that are made apparent by RST analysis. It has not been the aim to develop an analytical theory of monolog. Nevertheless, the work done here might stand as a starting point for the development of such a theory. If this were possible it would represent a full step of progress in our understanding of the functioning of talk.

Organizational Communication and Genre

Recent work has started to apply genre approaches to professional communication (Yates & Orlikowski 1992, Comprone 1993). Comprone seeks the applicability of genre studies as developed in Australia, see Reid 1987, to the teaching of technical writing. It concludes that genre should not be reduced to a set of rigid constraints to form a template for technical writing practice. Rather, a generic approach should be combined with an awareness of the rhetoric of the particular situation of text production in order to guide students in their writing tasks. This thesis has taken a primarily textual approach to the document design processes it deals with, but does not ignore rhetoric. Variations in adopted strategy in the various meetings are often assigned to variation in local contingent conditions of the interaction.

This thesis also deals with the social processes by which technical writing and public relations texts come into being. It shows that these instrumental activities also have generic features, not just the final product texts. From a teaching perspective this thesis provides support for a genre based approach to writing by offering genre guidelines for the kind of process that needs to be engaged in for professional documents to be produced. In terms of the Sydney genre debate (again see Reid 1987), this thesis is clearly most sympathetic to the approach of Martin, Kress, Rothery and Christie. Creativity in the classroom is not likely to be stifled by a genre approach, rather it should be stimulated by the chance to produce text in the appropriate culturally recognised form. The main objection of the `Expressionists' to the genre approach is that it enforces a straightjacket onto young learners. Dixon (1987) is quite willing to accept the notion of 'generic choices' being made throughout the process of text production. This seems to me a good point for compromise. The genre school need to relax the position they take regarding the formal properties of genres in such texts as the following.

> Each of these genres [scientific paper, interview, classroom lesson, pupil group discussion] shows adherence to strict formal structural criteria, quite as strict say as those of say, the Shakespearean sonnet.
> (Kress 1985, p.143)

Lemke's work on classroom interaction (Lemke 1990a) and this thesis show that 'strict formal criteria' are not necessarily the case for genres of spoken interaction. There is strategic choice available, and rhetorical choice imposed by local features of the situation and its participants. This being the case, Dixon's notion of 'genre choice' is quite apposite and represents a processual approach to genre rather than a given template. This should be sufficient to convince those who are antipathetic to the genre school position that a genre approach to writing, be it at school or for learning technical writing or public relations, is in no way a restriction on the writer's creativity. On the contrary it provides a meaning centered framework for creativity in which creativity can occur.

More work is needed on complex genres such as those addressed by this thesis. As a direct follow up to the work produced here I suggest that more work is urgently needed on the social processes that lead to writing, particularly writing as professional communication. As Comprone says, 'technical writing may provide the clearest example of how this balance between intention and genre works', (Comprone 1993, p.96). This thesis shows how in an organisational setting writing is a socially conducted practice. Groups interact for the accomplishment of the task. This interaction takes place in regularly occurring ways and the texts produced have regularly occurring features. This is evidenced here, as is the uniqueness of any one produced text and the social process that lead to its production. Lemke (1991) calls for a study of the process of production of texts, specifically 'where earlier and later drafts of a text are available'. This is precisely the case for writing in organisational settings and the study of revised drafts of public relations and technical writing texts should be able to move on apace. More draft checking data, as analysed in this thesis, will also be necessary to trace the dynamics of socio-cultural text production.

Genre and Casual Conversation

A final research implication from this thesis and its use of linguistically grounded analytical methods is to investigate the myth of casual conversation and to see if it is not replaceable with a genre approach. This would involve close analysis of talk that generally passes under the heading of casual conversation to see if in reality there were not a number of different genres of casual talk that could be identified. Such genres would be likely to be of a fluid nature, easily flowing from one to another but still recognisable as different kinds of talk, with different functional elements and different ways of unfolding. The Conversation Analytic base approach to organisational talk, of seeing it as reduced variants on casual conversation, would come under increasing pressure and be replaced as a dominant paradigm for research based on generic approaches to text. This would lead to more comparative study of different kinds of organisational communication. As expertise in dealing with longer participant turns grows then a balance could be regained between the conversation analytic obsession with the analysis of question - answer type data (see Drew and Heritage 1992), where typically one participant is professional and the other lay, and studies of talk within or between organisations that is not based on question answer sequences (see this thesis). Such data demands flexible analytical approaches. This thesis offers a starting point for their development and application.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Akindele, F. 1988. The structure of family conversation in Yoruba. In R. Veltman & E. Steiner (Eds.) Pragmatics, Discourse and Text. London: Pinter.

Applbaum, R.L. 1984 . Structure in group decision making in Cathcart and Samovar 1984. Small Group Communication: a reader.

Aronsson, K & Rundstom, B, 1989. Cats and dogs and sweets in clinical negotiation of reality. On politeness and coherence in pediatric discourse. Language and Society. 18, 483-504.

Atkinson, J.M & Drew, P. 1979. Order in Court. London: Macmillan.

Bakhtin, M. M. 1986. Speech Genres and other Late Essays. (original work published in 1953) Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bales, R.F. 1950. Interaction Process Analysis: A method for the study of small groups. Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Bales, R.F. & Strodbeck, F. L. 1951. Phases in Group Problem Solving.Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. 46, 485-95.

Beach, W. A. 1984. Talking in groups: understanding conversational structure. In R.S. Cathcart and L.A. Samovar 1984. Small Group Communication:a reader.

Beaugrand, R. de, & Dressler, W.U. 1981. Introduction to Text Linguistics. London: Longman

Beekman, J.& Callow, J. 1974. Translating the Word of God. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.

Benson, J.D & Greaves, W.S. (Eds.) 1981. Field of Discourse: theory and application. Applied Linguistics 2 (1), 45-55.

Benson, J.D & Greaves, W.S. (Eds.) 1985. Systemic Perspectives on Discourse Vol 1. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Benson, J.D & Greaves, W.S (Eds.) 1988. Systemic Functional Approaches to Discourse. Selected papers from the 12th international systemics workshop. Advances in Discourse Processing 26. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bernstein, B (Ed). 1973. Class, Codes and Control, vol 2. Applied Studies Towards a Sociology of Language. Primary Socialisation, Language and Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Berry, M. 1980. They're all out of step except our Johnny: a discussion of motivation (or the lack of it) in systemic linguistics. University of Nottingham Mimeo.

Berry, M. 1981a. Systemic linguistics and discourse analysis: a multilayered approach to exchange structure. In M. Coulthard and M. Montgomery, Studies in Discourse Analysis. London: Routledge.

Berry, M. 1981b. Polarity, ellipticity and propositional development, their relevance to the well-formedness of an exchange. Nottingham Linguistic Circular 10, 1, 36-63.

Berry, M. 1982. Review of Halliday 1978. Nottingham Linguistic Circular, no 11, 64-94.

Biber, D. 1988. Variation Across Speech and Writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brandstatter, H, Davis, J.H. & Stocker - Kreichgauer, G. (Eds.) 1982. Group Decision Making. London: Academic Press.

Brown, P & Levinson, S. 1987. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Use. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burton, D. 1980. Dialogue and Discourse. London:

Routledge and Kegan Paul.
Butler, C.S. 1985. Systemic Linguistics. Theory and Applications. London: Batsford.
Butler, C.S. 1989. Systemic models: unity, diversity and change. WORD, 40, 1-35.
Button, G. & Casey, N. 1984. Generating topic: the use of topic initial elicitors. In J.M Atkinson and J. Heritage (eds) Structures of Social Interaction: Studies in Conversational Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cathcart, R.S. & Samovar, L.A. (Eds.) 1984. Small Group Communication: a reader. New York: W.C. Brown.
Cheepen, C. and Monaghan J. 1990. Spoken English A.Practical Guide. London: Pinter.
Chiu, R. 1973. Measuring register characteristics. IRAL, XI, I, 51-68.
Christie, F. 1991. First and Second Order Registers in Education. In E. Ventola (Ed.) Functional and Systemic Linguistics (approaches and uses). Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 55. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Cook, G. 1989. Discourse. London: OUP.
Comprone, J.J. 1993. Generic constraints and expressive motives: rhetorical perspectives on textual dialogues. In N.R. Blyler & C. Thralls (Eds.) Professional Communication. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
Coulthard, R.M. & Montgomery, M. (Eds.) 1981. Studies in Discourse Analysis. London: Routledge.
Coupland, N 1983. Patterns of Encounter management: Further arguments for discourse variables. Language in Society. 12, 459-476.
Couture, B 1986. Functional Approaches to Writing

research perspectives. London: Pinter.

Craig, R.T. & Tracy, K. (Eds.) 1983. Conversational Coherence Form, Structure and Strategy. London: Sage Publications.

Crow, B. 1983. Topic shifts in couples' conversations. In R.T. Craig and K. Tracy (Eds.) Conversational Coherence Form, Structure and Strategy. London: Sage Publications.

Davies, A. 1976. The notion of register. Educational Review 22: 1, 64-77.

Davies, F. 1985. Towards a methodology for identifying information structures based on topic type: a classroom based approach to the analysis of text in specific subject areas. In J.M Ulijn & A.K. Pugh (Eds.) Reading for Professional Purposes: methods and materials in teaching languages. Leuwen, Belgium; ACCO.

Davies, F. 1986. Structure and language of textbooks across the curriculum. In M.L. Tickoo (Ed.) Language in Learning. Selected papers from the twentieth SEAMEO Regional Language Centre Seminar on Language Across the Curriculum. Singapore; RELC.

Davies, F. 1992. Writing across Text-Types and Genres. The potential of marked theme as a device for structuring text. Paper presented at Nottingham International Systemics Conference 1992.

Davies, F. & Greene, T. 1984. Reading for Learning in the Sciences. Edinburgh: Oliver Boyd for the Schools Council.

Dixon, J. 1987. The Question of Genres. In I. Reid (Ed.) The Place of Genre in Learning. (Typereader Publications No 1). Geelong Australia: Deakin University Press.

Donohue, W.A. & Diez, M. 1985. Directive use in negotiation interaction. Communication Monographs. 52, 305-18.

Drew, P. & Heritage, J. (Eds.) 1992. Talk at Work. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Drew, P. & Heritage, J. 1992. Analyzing talk at work: an introduction. In P. Drew, & J. Heritage, (Eds.) Talk at Work, 3-65.

Dumesnil, J. & Dorval, B. 1989. The development of talk activity frames that foster perspective focused talk among peers. Discourse Processes. 12, 193-225.

Ellis, J & Ure, J.N. 1969. Registers. In C.S. Butler and R.R.K. Hartmann (Eds.) A Reader in Language Variety. Exeter: Exeter University.

Enkvist, N. 1991. Discourse strategies and discourse types. In Functional and Systemic Linguistics: Approaches and Uses, E.Ventola (Ed.), 3-22. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Fawcett, R.P., van der Mije, A. & van Wisen, C. 1988. Towards a systemic flowchart model for discourse structure. In R.P. Fawcett & D.J. Young. (Eds.) New Developments in Systemic Linguistics Vol 2: Theory and Application. London: Pinter.

Fawcett, R.P. & Young, D.J. (Eds.) 1988. New Developments in Systemic Linguistics Vol 2: Theory and Application. London: Pinter.

Ferguson, C.A. 1983. Sports announcer talk: syntactic aspects of register variation. Language in Society. 12, 153-172.

Firth, A. 1991. Discourse at Work. Ph.D Thesis Dept of Languages and Cultural Studies, Aalborg University.

Fisher, B.A. 1974. Small Group Decision Making: Communication and the Group Process. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Fisher, B.A. & Ellis, D.G. 1990. Small Group Decision Making. New York: Mcgraw Hill.

Ford, C. 1987. Overlapping relations in text structure. In Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the Pacific Linguistics Society. S. Delancey & R. Tomlin (Eds.), 107-123. Linguistics Dept: University of Oregon.

Fox, B.A. 1987. Discourse Structure and Anaphora in Written and Conversational English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Francis, D.W. 1986. Some structures of negotiation talk. Language in Society. 15, 53-80.

Francis, G. 1986. Anaphoric Nouns. Discourse Analysis Monographs 11. Birmingham: Birmingham University ELR.

Francis, G. 1989. Thematic selection and distribution in written discourse. Word 40, 201-223.

Garfinkel, H. 1967. Studies in Ethnomethodology. Eaglewood Cliffs NJ: Prentice Hall.

Giddens, A. 1979. Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, structure and contradiction in social analysis. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goodwin, C. 1981. Conversational Organisation Between Speakers and Hearers. New York: Academic Press.

Greatbatch, D. 1988. A turn taking system for British news interviews. Language in Society. 17, 401-430.

Gregory, M. 1980. Review of Halliday 1978. Applied Linguistics 1, 74-81.

Gregory, M. & Caroll, S. 1978. Language and Situation: language varieties and their social contexts. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1970. A Course in Spoken English: Intonation. London: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1978. Language as a Social Semiotic. London. Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1979. Modes of meaning and modes of expression: types of grammatical structure and their determination by different semantic functions. In Allerton, D.J., Carney, E., & Holdcroft, D. (Eds.), Function and Context in Linguistic Analysis: Essays offered to Willianm Haas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1980. Language as code and language as behaviour: a systemic - functional interpretation of the nature and ontogenesis of dialogue. In S. Lamb & A. Makkai (Eds.) Semiotics in Culture and Language. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. An Introduction to Functional Grammar. London: Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1985. Spoken and Written Language. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K., McIntosh, A & Strevens, P. D. 1964. The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching. London: Longman.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. 1976. Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. 1985. Language, Context, and Text: aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K, Gibbons, J. & Nicholas, H (Eds.) 1990. Learning, Keeping and Using Language. Selected Papers from the 8th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Sydney, 1987. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hasan, R. 1973. Code, register and social dialect.

In B. Bernstein (Ed.) Class, Codes and Control, vol 2. Applied Studies Towards a Sociology of Language. Primary Socialisation, Language and Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Hasan, R. 1984. Nursery tale as genre. Nottingham Linguistic Circular. 413, 71-102.

Hatch, E. 1992. Discourse and Language Education. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heritage, J. 1984. Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hoey, M. 1983 On the Surface of Discourse. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Hoey, M. 1986. Overlappping patterns of discourse organisation and their implications for clause relational analysis of problem - solution texts. In C.R. Cooper, & S. Greenbaum (Eds.) Studying Writing 187 -214. Beverley Hills: Sage.

Hoey, M. 1991. Another perspective on coherence and cohesive harmony. In E. Ventola (Ed.) Functional and Systemic Linguistics (approaches and uses). Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 55. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hoey, M & Winter, E. 1986. Clause relations and the writer's communicative task. In B. Couture (Ed.) Functional Approaches to Writing 120-141.

Houtkoop, H. 1987. Establishing Agreement: An analysis of proposal-acceptance sequences. Dordrecht: Foris.

Hymes, D. 1964. Towards ethnographies of communication: the analysis of communicative events. In P.P. Giglioli (Ed.) Language and Social Context. London: Penguin.

Hymes, D. 1974. Foundations in Sociolinguistics. An Ethnographic Approach. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Jackson, S. & Jacobs, S. 1981. The collaborative production of proposals in conversational argument and persuasion: a study of disagreement regulation. Journal of the American Forensic Association. 18, 77-90.

Jordan, M.P. 1988. Some advances in clause relational theory. In J.D. Benson & W.S. Greaves (Eds.) Systemic Functional Approaches to Discourse. Selected papers from the 12th international systemics workshop. Advances in Discourse Processing 26. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Kay, H. 1991. Topic types revisited: the humanities. Reading in a Foreign Language 7:2, 1-24.

Kress, G. 1982. Learning to Write. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kress, G. 1985. Sociolinguistic development and the mature language user: different voices for different occasions. In G. Wells & J. Nicholls (Eds.) Language and Learning: an interactional perspective : London: Falmer, 135 - 149.

Kumpf, L. 1986. Structuring Narratives in a Second Language: A Description of Rhetoric and Grammar. Ph.D Thesis, University of California at Los Angeles.

Labov, W. & Waletzky, J. 1967. Narrative analysis: oral versions of personal experience. In Helm, J. (Ed.) Essays on the Verbal and Visual Arts. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

Labov, W & Fanshel, D. 1977. Therapeutic Discourse: Psychotherapy as Conversation. New York: Academic Press.

Lampi, M. 1986. Linguistic Components of Strategy in Business Negotiations. Helsinki: Helsinki School of Economics.

Lemke, J.L. 1985. Ideology, intertextuality, and the notion of register. In J.D. Benson and W.S Greaves (Eds.) Systemic Perspectives on Discourse Vol 1. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lemke, J.L. 1988a. Discourses in Conflict: Heteroglossia and text semantics. In J.D. Benson and W.S Greaves (Eds.) Systemic Functional Approaches to Discourse. Selected papers from the 12th international systemics workshop. Advances in Discourse Processing 26. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Lemke, J.L. 1988b. Text structure and text semantics. In R. Veltman & E. Steiner (Eds.) Pragmatics, Discourse and Text. London: Pinter.

Lemke, J.L. 1989. Semantics and social values. Word 40:37-50.

Lemke, J.L. 1990a. Talking Science: Language learning and values. Norwood NJ: Ablex.

Lemke, J.L. 1990b. Technical discourse and technocratic ideology. In M.A.K. Halliday, J.Gibbons and H,Nicholas (Eds.) Learning, Keeping and Using Language. Selected Papers from the 8th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Sydney, 1987. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Lemke, J.L. 1991. Text production and dynamic text semantics. In E. Ventola (Ed.) Functional and Systemic Linguistics (approaches and uses). Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 55. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Levinson, S. 1979. Activity types and language. Linguistics 17 (5,6), 356-399.

Levinson, S. 1981. The essential inadequacies of speech act models of dialogue. In H. Parrett, M. Sbisa, and J. Verschueren (Eds.) Possibilities and Limitations of Pragmatics.

Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Levinson, S. 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Longacre, R.E. 1983. A Grammar of Discourse. New York: Plenum Press.

Macintosh N.B & Scapens R.W 1990. Structuration theory in management accounting. Accounting Organizations and Society. 15/5 455-477.

Malcolm, K. 1988. Casual conversation: a message focussed register. In J.D. Benson & W.S. Greaves (Eds.) Systemic Functional Approaches to Discourse. Selected papers from the 12th international systemics workshop. Advances in Discourse Processing 26. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Malinowski, B. 1923. The problem of meaning in primitive languages. Supplement 1 to C.K. Ogden & I.A. Richards, The Meaning of Meaning. London: Kegan Paul.

Mann, W.C. & Thompson, S.A. 1986. Rhetorical structure theory: Description and construction of text structures. In G. Kempen (Ed.) Proceedings of the Third International Workshop on Text Generation. Nijmegen, The Netherlands, August 1986.

Mann, W.C & Thompson, S.A. 1988 Rhetorical structure theory: Towards a functional theory of text organisation. Text 8, (3), 243-281.

Mann. W.C. & Matthiessen, C. M. & Thompson, S.A. 1992. Rhetorical structure theory and text analysis. In W.C. Mann & S.A Thompson (Eds.) Discourse Description: Diverse Analyses of a Fund - Raising Text. Pragmatics and Beyond. New Series 16. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Mann. W.C. & Thompson, S.A. 1992. Discourse Description: Diverse Analyses of a Fund - Raising Text. Pragmatics and Beyond. New

Series 16. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Martin, J.R. 1981. How many speech acts? UEA Papers in Linguistics 14/15, 52-77.

Martin, J.R. 1983a. The development of register. In Freedle, R.O. & Fine, J. (Eds.) Developmental Issues in Discourse (Advances in Discourse Processes 10), Norwood, NJ, Ablex.

Martin, J.R. 1983b. Conjunction: The logic of English texts. In Janos. S. Petofi & Emil Sozer (Eds.) Papers in Text Linguistics. Volume 45: Micro and Macro Connexity of Texts. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.

Martin, J.R. 1984. Language, register and genre. In Language Studies: Children Writing: B.Ed Course study guide. Geelong, Australia: Deakin University Press, 21-30.

Martin, J.R. 1985. Process and text: two aspects of human semiosis. In J.D. Benson & W. S. Greaves (Eds.) Systemic Perspectives on Discourse Vol 1. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Martin, J.R. 1991 Nominalisation in science and the humanities: distilling knowledge and scaffolding text. In E. Ventola (Ed.) Functional and Systemic Linguistics (approaches and uses). Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 55. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Martin, J.R. & Rochester, S (1979) Crazy Talk. New York: Plenum Press

Martin, J.R. & Rothery, J 1980. Writing Report No.1 Working Papers in Linguistics, (Department of Linguistics, Sydney University 1980).

Martin, J.R. & Rothery, J 1981. Writing Report No. 2. Working Papers in Linguistics, (Department of Linguistics, Sydney University 1981).

Matthiessen, C. & Thompson, S.A. 1989. The structure of discourse and "subordination". In J. Haimon and S.A. Thompson (Eds.) Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Melrose, R. 1988. Systemic Linguistics and the communicative language syllabus. In R.P. Fawcett & D.J. Young. (Eds.) New Developments in Systemic LinguisticsVol 2: Theory and Application. London: Pinter.

Meyer, B.J.F. 1992. An analysis of a plea for money. In W.C. Mann & S. Thompson (Eds.) Discourse Description: Diverse Analyses of a Fund - Raising Text. Pragmatics and Beyond. New Series 16. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Miller, C. R. 1984. Genre as social action. Quarterly Journal of Speech 70, 151-67.

Morley, I. & Stephenson, G. 1977. The Social Psychology of Bargaining. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Munby, J. Communicative Syllabus Design. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Murray, D. 1987. Requests at work: negotiating the conditions for conversation. Management Communication Quarterly. 1 (1), 588-612.

Nofsinger, R. 1990. Everyday Conversation. Newbury Park: Sage.

Poole, M.S. 1981. Decision development in small groups I. A comparison of two models. Communication Monographs. 48: 1-24.

Poole, M.S. 1983. Decision development in small groups II. A study of multiple sequences in decision making. Communication Monographs. 50: 206-232.

Poole, M.S. 1985. Tasks and interaction sequences: a theory of coherence in group decision making interaction. In R.L Street, & J.N. Capella (Eds.), Sequence and Pattern in Communicative Behaviour. London: Arnold.

Poole, M.S., McPhee, R.D. & Seibold, D. R. 1982. A comparison of normative and interactional explanations of group decision making: social decision schemes versus valence distributions. Communication Monographs. 49, 1-19.

Poole, M.S. & De Sanctis G. 1990. Understanding the use of group decision support systems: the theory of adaptive structuration. In J. Fulk & C. W. Steinfield (Eds.), Organizations and communication technology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Potter, J. & Wetherell, M. 1987. Discourse and Social Psychology London: Sage Publications.

Putnam, L.L. 1985. Bargaining as task and process: multiple functions of interaction sequences. In Street, R.L. & Capella, J. N. Sequence and Pattern in Communicative Behaviour. London: Arnold.

Putnam, L.L. & Pacanowsky, M.E. 1983 Communications and Organisations. Beverley Hills: Sage Publications.

Pruitt, D.G. 1969. Indirect communication in the search for agreement in negotiation. Indirect Communications in Negotiations Project. Working Papers II.

Reid, I. (Ed.) 1987. The Place of Genre in Learning. (Typereader Publications No 1). Geelong Australia: Deakin University Press.

Sacks, H. 1992. Lectures on Conversation 2. Edited by G. Jefferson. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. A. and Jefferson, G. 1974. A simplest systematics for the organization of turn-taking for conversation. Language. 50 (4), 696-735.

Saville Troike, M. 1982. The Ethnography of

Communication. Baltimore: University Park Press.

Schegloff, E.A. 1987. Between macro and micro: contexts and other connections. In J. Alexander (Ed.) The Micro - Macro Link. Berkeley and Los Angeles; University of California Press.

Schegloff, E.A., Jefferson, G. and Sacks, H. 1977 The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. Language. 53, 361-382.

Schiffrin, D. 1987. Discourse Markers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shimanoff, S.B. 1984. Group interaction via communication rules. In R.S. Cathcart and L.A. Samovar, 1984. Small Group Communication: a reader.50-64.

Sinclair, J.McH, 1985. On the integration of linguistic description. In T. van Dijk (Ed.) Handbook of Discourse Analysis volume 2. London: Academic.

Sinclair, J. McH 1992. Trust the text. In L. Ravelli and M. Davis (Eds.) Advances in Systemic Linguistics, recent theory and practice. London: Pinter.

Sinclair, J. McH. & Coulthard, R. M. 1975. Towards an Analysis of Discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stewart, A. 1987. Clause Combining in Conchucos Quechua Discourse. Ph.D thesis, University of California at Los Angeles.

Street, R.L & Capella, J.N. (Eds.) 1985. Sequence and Pattern in Communicative Behaviour. London: Arnold.

Stubbs, M. 1983. Discourse Analysis. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Stubbs, M. (forthcoming) Institutional Linguistics:

language and institutions, linguistics and sociology. In M. Putz (Ed.) Thirty Years of Linguistic Evolution. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Swales, J. 1990. Genre Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Swales, J. 1992. Genre and Engagement. Paper Presented at the Nottingham International Systemic Linguistics Conference. August 1992.

Tannen, D. & Wallat, C. 1986. Medical professionals and parents: A linguistic analysis of communication across contexts. Language and Society. 15, 295-312.

Taylor, T.J. & Cameron, D. 1987. Analysing Conversation: Rules and Units in the Structure of Talk. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Thompson, S.A. & Mann, W.C 1987. `Antithesis: A study in clause combining and discourse structure. In R. Steele and T. Threadgold (Eds.) Language Topics: Essays in Honour of Michael Halliday, vol 2. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Threadgold, T., Grosz, E.A., Kress, K. & Halliday, M.A.K. (Eds.) 1986. Semiotics, Language and Ideology. Sydney: The Sydney Association for Studies in Society and Culture.

Tompkins, P.K & Cheney, G. (1983) Account analysis of orgaisations: decision making and identification. In L.L. Putnam, & M.E. Pacanowsky Communications and Organisations. Beverley Hills: Sage Publications.

Trujillo, N. 1983. Performing Mintzberg's roles: the nature of managerial communication. In L.L. Putnam, & M.E. Pacanowsky Communications and Organisations. Beverley Hills: Sage Publications.

Tsui, A.B.M. 1989a. Beyond the Adjacency Pair. Language in Society. 18, 545-564.

Tsui, A.B.M. 1989b. Systemic choices and discourse processes. Word, 40 (1- 2), 163-187.

Tuckman, B. 1965. Developmental sequences in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 63, 383-99.

Ulijn, J.M. & Pugh, A. K. (Eds.) Reading for Professional Purposes: methods and materials in teaching languages. Leuwen, Belgium: ACCO.

Ure, J.N. 1969. Lexical density and register differentiation. In Perren, G.E. & Trim, J.L.M. (Eds.) Applications of Linguistics: Selected Papers of the 2nd International Congress of Linguists. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T.A. 1977. Text and Context. Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse. London: Longman.

Van Dijk, T.A. 1980. Macrostructures: an interdisciplinary study of global structures in discourse, interaction and cognition. Hillsdale NJ: Erlbaum.

Van Dijk, T.A. 1981. Episodes as units of discourse analysis. Georgetown University Roundtable on Language and Linguistics, 177-195.

Van Dijk, T.A. 1985. Semantic discourse analysis. In T.A. van Dijk (Ed.) Handbook of Discourse Analysis vol 2. London: Academic.

Van Dijk, T.A. (Ed.) 1985. Handbook of Discourse Analysis vol 2. London: Academic.

Veltman, R. & Steiner, E. 1988. Pragmatics, Discourse and Text. London: Pinter.

Ventola, E. 1987. The Structure of Social Interaction: A systemic approach to the semiotics of service encounters. London: Pinter.

Ventola, E. 1988. The logical relations in exchanges. In: J.D. Benson & W. S. Greaves

(Eds.) Systemic Functional Approaches to Discourse. Selected papers from the 12th international systemics workshop. Advances in Discourse Processing 26. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Ventola, E. 1989. Problems of modelling and applied issues within the framework of genre. Word, 40, 129-161.

Ventola, E. (Ed.) 1991. Functional and Systemic Linguistics (approaches and uses). Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 55. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Virtanen, T. 1992 Issues of text typology: narrative a `basic' kind of text?. Text 12, (2), 293-310.

Walace, W.D. 1981. How registers register: toward the analysis of language use. IRAL xix (4), 267-286.

Weick, K. 1979. The Social Psychology of Organising (2nd ed). Reading MA: Addison-Wesley.

Weick,K. 1983. Organisational communication: towards a research agenda. In L.L. Putnam, & M.E. Pacanowsky Communications and Organisations. Beverley Hills: Sage Publications.

Weizman, E. 1982. Some register characteristics of journalistic language: are they universal? Applied Linguistics, 5 (1), 41-49.

Werlich, E. 1986. The relevance of text type grammar to foreign language teaching; with a note on text type switches. In G. Leitner The English Reference Grammar: Language and Linguistics, Writers and Readers. Tubingen: Niemeyer.

Wheatley, J.S. 1990. Modality as a Register Defining Characteristic. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Dept of English, University of Birmingham.

Winter, E. 1982. Towards a Contextual Grammar of English. London: George Allen and Unwin.

Wooffitt, R.C. 1992. Telling Tales of the Unexpected, the organisation of factual discourse. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Yates, J. & Orlikowski, W.J. 1992. Genres of organizational communication: A structurational approach to studying communication and media. Academy of Management Review 17, 299-326.

Young, D. 1985. Some applications of systemic analysis to TEFL or whatever happened to register analysis. In J.D. Benson, & W.S. Greaves, (Eds.) 1985. Systemic Perspectives on Discourse Vol 1.